PB-241 261

SULPHUR COMPOUND EMISSIONS OF THE PETROLEUM PRODUCTION INDUSTRY

M. W. Kellogg Company

Prepared for:

National Environmental Research Center

December 1974

DISTRIBUTED BY:

NTIS

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

TECHNICAL REPORT DATA
(Please read Instructions on the reverse before completing)

1. REPORT NO. EPA-650/2-75-030	2.	3. PB 241 261

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Sulfur Compound Emissions of the Petroleum
Production Industry

5. REPORT DATE
December 1974

6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE

7. AUTHOR(S) Ecology Audits, Inc.
9995 Monroe Drive, Dallas, Texas 75220

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS
The M.W. Kellogg Co.
300 Three Greenway Plaza East
Houston, Texas 77046

10. PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.
1AB013; ROAP 21ADE-010

11. CONTRACT/GRANT NO.
68-02-1308, Task 26

12. SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS
EPA, Office of Research and Development
NERC-RTP, Control Systems Laboratory
Research Triangle Park, NC 27711

13. TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED
Task Final, 5-11/74

14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE

15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

16. ABSTRACT
The report gives results of a study of sulfur compound emissions from the Permian Basin and the Smackover Formation, two areas that represent about 80% of the sulfur emissions from oil and gas fields in the U.S. SO2 emissions from these two areas are estimated to be 664,000 short tons per year, of which 384,000 short tons per year are from Claus plant tail gases. H2S emissions are estimated to be 9000 short tons per year. The report lists the plants studied and tabulates the production of sulfur emissions by counties.

PRICES SUBJECT TO CHANGE

17. KEY WORDS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

a. DESCRIPTORS		b. IDENTIFIERS/OPEN ENDED TERMS	c. COSATI Field/Group	
Air Pollution	Fuels	Air Pollution Control	13B,	21D
Emissions		Stationary Sources		
Petroleum Refining		Permian Basin	13H	
Petroleum Products		Smackover Formation		
Sulfur Oxides			07B	
Hydrogen Sulfide				

18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT Unlimited	19. SECURITY CLASS *(This Report)* Unclassified	21. NO. OF PAGES 170
	20. SECURITY CLASS *(This page)* Unclassified	22. PRICE $6.25/2.25

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
US Department of Commerce
Springfield, VA. 22151

EPA Form 2220-1 (9-73)

EPA REVIEW NOTICE

This report has been reviewed by the National Environmental Research Center - Research Triangle Park, Office of Research and Development, EPA, and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

RESEARCH REPORTING SERIES

Research reports of the Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, have been grouped into series. These broad categories were established to facilitate further development and application of environmental technology. Elimination of traditional grouping was consciously planned to foster technology transfer and maximum interface in related fields. These series are:

1. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH EFFECTS RESEARCH
2. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY
3. ECOLOGICAL RESEARCH
4. ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING
5. SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES
6. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS
9. MISCELLANEOUS

This report has been assigned to the ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY series. This series describes research performed to develop and demonstrate instrumentation, equipment and methodology to repair or prevent environmental degradation from point and non-point sources of pollution. This work provides the new or improved technology required for the control and treatment of pollution sources to meet environmental quality standards.

This document is available to the public for sale through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

Publication No. EPA-650/2-75-030

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE NO.

GLOSSARY iv

I. INTRODUCTION 1

A. Sources of Sulfur Emissions in the Petroleum and Natural Gas Production Industry 1

B. General Sources of Pertinent Data 14

II. OVERALL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 15

III. PART I - A STUDY TO ASSESS THE OPTIMUM METHOD TO COLLECT DATA 18

A. Summary 18

B. Purpose of the Study 20

C. Evaluation of Information Sources 23

D. Recommendations for Estimating Emissions From the Petroleum Production Industry 36

IV. PART II - COLLECTION OF DATA AND EVALUATION OF SULFUR COMPOUND EMISSIONS 44

A. Summary and Conclusions 44

B. Purpose and Methods 46

C. Summary of Emissions for Study Area 75

V. APPENDICES

1. List of Plants Studied 1-1
2. Production of Sulfur by Counties 2-1
3. Report Forms Used by Several State Petroleum Regulatory Agencies 3-1
4. Ecology Audits, Inc. Data Forms 4-1
5. Tabular Data for Plants Studied 5-1
6. M.W.Kellogg's Evaluation of the Assumptions, Methods and Results in IV 6-1

GLOSSARY

Acid Gas

A blend of hydrogen sulfide (H_2S) and carbon dioxide (CO_2) that is separated by the amine process from raw natural gas. Most plants meter their total acid gas.

Amine Process

A process using one of the amines in which raw natural gas is bubbled through the solution which absorbs essentially all CO_2 and H_2S (acid gas). The solution is regenerated by boiling and the acid gas sent on for further processing.

Casinghead Gas

The term used to denote that the gas is principally solution gas produced in association with crude oil.

Drilling Mud

A fluid system containing clay materials and weighting agents and circulated in a drilling well to cool and lubricate the drill bit and to conduct the drilled materials to the surface.

Field

A single well or group of wells that penetrate and produce from one or more petroleum-bearing formations.

Flare Stack

One common way to dispose of acid gas is to mix it with some raw natural gas and burn it at the end of a flare stack. The combustion takes place in the natural atmosphere and in virtually all the studies done by Ecology Audits, the combustion of H_2S to SO_2 is over 98 percent complete. Sometimes a strong wind will extinguish a flare causing emissions of hydrogen sulfide until the flare is re-ignited.

Formation

A strata or series of associated earth materials having similar conditions of origin. A single petroleum well will often produce from several formations in a vertical sequence, and the fluids found in each may be significantly different chemically. As a result, the composition of the produced fluid may change with time.

Gasoline Plant

A gas processing plant that separates natural gasoline (pentanes and hexanes-and-heavier) from natural gas streams. These plants also often produce ethane, propane and butane. By definition, these plants produce either natural gasoline or blends from which gasoline can be separated.

Grains per 100 std. cu. ft. (Gr./100 ft.^{3})

Standard term for reporting H_2S concentration in natural gas. 1 Gr./100 ft.^{3} is equivalent to 16 ppm (parts per million) of H_2S in natural gas.

Sour Gas

Natural gas containing hydrogen sulfide in concentrations of 4 to 16 ppm or greater.

Sulfur Recovery Plants

A plant which recovers elemental sulfur from a charge gas stream composed principally of a mixture of H_2S and CO_2. Where the acid gas stream is sufficient, an operator will elect to install a sulfur recovery plant. Sometimes these plants are operated in conjunction with gasoline plants, and at other times they are built independently of any additional gas processing facilities.

Sweet Gas

Natural gas whose hydrogen sulfide content is less than approximately 4 ppm.

Sweetening Plant

A plant which processes a sour natural gas charge stream, selectively recovers the H_2S and CO_2 content and yields a sweet natural gas stream and an acid gas (H_2S and CO_2) stream as products.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. SOURCES OF SULFUR EMISSIONS IN THE PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS PRODUCTION INDUSTRY

The most common volatile sulfur compound found in petroleum and encountered in petroleum and natural gas production is hydrogen sulfide. Natural gas is considered to be sour if the hydrogen sulfide content exceeds a certain level which varies from 4 ppm to 16 ppm, depending on the company or government body. The Texas Air Control Board considers crude oil to be sour if it emits a sour gas.[1]

Other sulfur compounds found in petroleum include mercaptans, organic sulfur complexes and dissolved elemental sulfur. Sour natural gas contains hydrogen sulfide in widely varying concentrations, plus trace amounts of organic sulfur compounds such as mercaptans, carbonyl sulfide (COS) and carbon disulfide (CS_2). Gases processed as part of refinery operations often contain much larger quantities of organic sulfur compounds, but these contribute insignificant amounts in the field production operations.

Nearly all of the dissolved hydrogen sulfide in crude oil volatilizes in field storage. For example, while the well stream in the Jay Field is 8 to 10 percent hydrogen sulfide, the concentration of hydrogen sulfide in the crude going to a refinery is less than 50 ppm. Other compounds, minor in quantity, remain in the crude oil and are part of the feedstock in a refinery.

---

[1] Definitions 1.31 and 1.32, General Rules, Texas Air Control Board, November 1, 1973.

1. Location of Sour Gas and Oil

The petroleum industry uses special terminology to describe the locations of petroleum. A well is drilled through several formations. Near the surface there are often fresh water aquifers. At greater depths there are saline aquifers and, hopefully, one or more petroleum bearing formations. In some locations a single well can extract petroleum from several formations, each at different depths. The extent of the petroleum bearing formation is found by drilling a series of wells. The series of wells is called a field.

One formation from which the petroleum production is nearly always sour is the "Smackover". It runs in a large arc from south of San Antonio, Texas, northeasterly along the southern boundary of Arkansas to Jackson, Mississippi, to Pensacola, Florida. Geologists anticipate that the drilling proposed for offshore Florida will produce sour gas and oil.

Another area in which sour production is often found is the Permian Basin. Between 10 and 20 percent of the wells in this area of West Texas and Southeastern New Mexico produce sour petroleum. There are also some sour fields in Wyoming, Michigan, Oklahoma, California, Ohio, Montana, Colorado, Arizona and North Dakota. However, it is estimated that the production from the Smackover formation and Permian Basin represents about 80 percent of total sour petroleum production in the United States.

Petroleum found in other areas is usually sweet. This includes the present production of coastal and offshore areas of Texas, much of Louisiana, and all of Alaska.

2. Drilling and Testing Operations

When a well is drilled, the bit is lubricated and cooled with "drilling muds". These muds are circulated to the surface to remove the cuttings. Most operators monitor the muds for the presence of hydrocarbons, and if it is expected, hydrogen sulfide.

When a well is to be "completed" the petroleum is allowed to flow freely and push the mud and cuttings out of the hole. Natural gas is flared during this operation while the muds and oil flow into a settling basin or temporary tanks. The oil, too, is often flared. The particulates arising from these fires are a worse problem than sulfur dioxide. Well completions generally require no more than portions of a day or two and represent only a minor fraction of sulfur emissions.

Some states require that all wells be tested periodically, usually annually. When this is done, the well is allowed to flow freely for up to several hours to determine its productivity. The gas produced during this test is frequently flared.

During the life of a well, it is likely that between 0.001 and 0.1 percent of production is emitted to the atmosphere during drilling and testing.

3. Production of Oil

Gas, and frequently saline water, is produced along with crude oil. When the mixture gets to the surface it flows through separator units. The oil then flows to a tank battery, the water is reinjected or disposed of otherwise, and the gas is disposed of in one of several ways.

One common way to break down a crude oil/water emulsion is to heat it. Thus, some of the produced gas or oil is used at the well site as fuel to furnish heat in a "heater-treater". Sulfur dioxide will be emitted if the fuel for the heater-treater is sour.

Produced gas (called casinghead gas if found associated in essentially solution ratio proportions with oil) is usually collected in a gathering system and sent to a processing plant. In some instances where there are no gathering or sweetening facilities, flaring is authorized by the petroleum regulatory agency on a temporary basis. In other cases, the petroleum regulatory agency will force a field to be closed until facilities are available to handle the gas to prevent its loss.

Crude oil is usually stored in a tank battery for several days, and this permits most of the gases such as hydrogen sulfide and carbon dioxide to escape. The vapors from sour crude oil contain hydrogen sulfide. Many states, including Texas, New Mexico, and Mississippi, regulate the quantities of hydrogen sulfide that can be present in ambient air. As a result, many tank batteries located near residences have vapor recovery systems. The vapors from stored crude can be quite valuable so, aside from any air pollution interests, many firms install vapor recovery systems as an economic investment. Additional investment in vapor recovery systems can be expected as the price of natural gas and natural-gas liquids increases. The recovered vapors are collected in a gathering system. On rare occasions where the purpose of the recovery system is to reduce hydrogen sulfide emissions to the atmosphere and there is no economical way to treat the gas, it is burned in a flare.

4. Production of Gas

Natural gas is found in reservoirs sometimes with and sometimes without oil. If found with oil, it is called "casinghead" gas. The majority of gas production, both from gas wells and casinghead gas, is collected and sent to processing plants. In Texas, for example, reports show that 1.8 percent of casinghead gas is vented or flared while only 0.016 percent of gas well gas is vented or flared.[2] The gas moves through gathering systems and normally none escapes except for leaks in valves or at compressor stations. Occasionally some will be flared because of a processing plant malfunction or as a safety device.

---

[2] Annual Report of the Oil and Gas Division, 1973, The Railroad Commission of Texas.

5. Processing of Gas

All processing of gas is done either to provide a product which conforms to customer standards or to maximize financial profit while conforming to regulatory requirements.

a. Customer Standards

Gas pipelines have standards which set minimum values for heat content and maximum values for contaminants such as sulfur compounds and water. Heat content can be improved by removal of nitrogen and carbon dioxide. Hydrogen sulfide, the principal sulfur compound, and carbon dioxide are most frequently removed by an amine scrubbing system. When sour gas is found some distance from a processing plant, producers may install small packaged units to remove acid gases (carbon dioxide and hydrogen sulfide) prior to sending it on via pipeline. The tail gases from these small units are either burned in an incinerator, burned in a flare or vented.

b. Maximize Profits

The processing of lease separator gases can be very profitable. The most common processing involves separation of the heavier, easily liquified hydrocarbons from ethane and methane, the light gaseous components. Methane (CH_4) is the principal component of natural gas, but it has the lowest heat value per unit volume and the lowest relative price. Propane (C_3H_8) and butane (C_4H_{10}) are familiar bottled gases and have higher heat values and command higher prices. Heavier hydrocarbons such as pentane, hexanes and heavier are generally processed to make motor fuel.

c. Gasoline Plants

The definition of gasoline plants varies. Plants that produce a blend of natural gas liquids (NGL) are frequently called natural gas plants. The Texas Railroad Commission reserves the term for those plants which produce gasoline (pentane and hexane-and-heavier fractions). An increasing portion of new plants produce natural gas liquids which are sent to existing gasoline plants for fractionation.

These types of plants are expensive to construct and costly to operate. Unless a stream has a flow of at least a few million cubic feet per day, a processing plant may not be financially attractive. As a result, many smaller fields sell gas to pipelines without processing to remove heavier hydrocarbons.

There are numerous existing gas processing installations in the Permian Basin area of West Texas and Southeastern New Mexico. As a result, there is more complexity associated with processing in this area. Plant operators try to maximize profit by keeping their plants operating at capacity. As a result, some operators do only partial processing. For example, in one location, the producer sells the gas to gas pipeline Company A who compresses the gas and sells it to oil Company B who extracts the propanes and heavier components and sells the still sour gas stream back to A who sweetens it at a plant some twenty miles away. Oil Company B flares the amine regenerator stream resulting from the sweetening of its products. Both firms emit to the atmosphere sulfur compounds from the same original gas stream.

In the other areas studied, there was far less complexity because plants are built to serve the needs of a particular field or area.

To minimize corrosion in the plant, most operators sweeten plant charge streams in which the hydrogen sulfide content exceeds 1/4 grain/100 SCF (4 ppm). The tail gases from the sweetening plant are used in several ways. If there is a sufficient quantity of sulfur, usually more than 5 long tons per day, a sulfuric acid plant or a sulfur recovery plant will be built. In most cases, the tail gases from sulfur recovery and sulfuric acid plants are incinerated, vented or flared, although occasionally they are reinjected to maintain reservoir pressure.

d. Cycling Plants

In a number of fields the produced gas is processed to remove the heavier components and the gas is reinjected into the formation to maintain pressure and increase ultimate recovery. These are called cycling operations. The produced gas is often first sweetened prior to processing and reinjection.

e. Other

Another market for sour natural gas is carbon black manufacturers where the sulfur content in the raw material is not detrimental to the end product.

Another minor market is in power plants which have been equipped to burn sour gas.

6. Shipment of Natural Gas

The great bulk of the approximately 21 trillion cubic feet of[3] natural gas consumed in the United States annually is transported between the gas producing areas and gas distribution utilities by about 20 major gas transmission companies. Each firm sets its own purchasing standards which typically are the same as those in the tariffs filed with the Federal Power Commission.

The most common standard for hydrogen sulfide is a maximum 0.25 grains per 100 standard cubic feet or about 4 parts per million. It has been found that gas containing more hydrogen sulfide than this not only presents health hazards to pipeline workers, but causes excessive corrosion damage, particularly in compressors. Because of the general shortage of natural gas at current prices, transmission companies will consider the purchase of gas with hydrogen sulfide levels up to 1 gr/100 SCF if it will not result, upon dilution with gas in their system, in concentrations exceeding 0.25 gr/100 SCF.

---

[3] U.S. Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstract of the United States 1971, p. 645.

Another common standard for natural gas is 20 grains of total sulfur per 100 standard cubic feet of gas. One exception to this is Transwestern Pipeline Company which specifies only a 0.5 gr/100 SCF tariff with Southern California Gas. As a practical matter, hydrogen sulfide is rarely less than 95 percent of the total sulfur content. The reason for the total sulfur standard has to do with the end users. Sulfur can "poison" catalysts in petrochemical plants using natural gas feedstocks and cause discoloration or embrittlement of certain metals during heat treating. Sulfur can also cause discoloration of glass used to make engineered products such as light bulbs and television picture tubes.

The mercaptans used to odorize natural gas are usually added by the distribution utility unless local laws require the transmission companies to do this.

The accompanying schematic flow sheet, Fig. 1, illustrates the various sources and channels of disposition of gaseous materials which are encountered in the production of petroleum and natural gas.


FLARE DURING WELL TESTING & COMPLETION
GAS OIL WATER
LEASE EXHAUST
VENT OR FLARE
LEASE SEPARATORS DEHYDRATORS ETC.
FUEL FOR LEASE
GAS
OIL OR CONDENSATE
WATER
TO TREATMENT PLANT, REINJECTION OR DISPOSAL
SOUR GAS
FEEDSTOCK TO CHEMICAL PLANTS
EMERGENCY FLARE
SOUR GAS
GAS SWEETENING PLANT
CO_2+H_2S
TAIL GASES
TO FLARE, VENT OR INCINERATOR
CO_2+H_2S
SULFUR PLANT
$CO_2+H_2S+SO_2+N_2+H_2O$
ELEMENTAL SULFUR
SWEET GAS
SWEET GAS
REINJECTION OR PIPE LINE
EMERGENCY FLARE
GAS PROCESSING PLANT
NATURAL GAS (C_1+C_2)
LIQUIFIED PETROLEUM GAS (LPG) (C_3+C_4)
HIGHER HYDROCARBONS (C_5 & HEAVIER)
RECOVERED VAPORS
VENT
TANK BATTERY
TANK FARM
REFINERY
---------LEASE FUEL

Fig. 1. **SOURCE & DISPOSITION OF GAS IN PETROLEUM PRODUCTION OPERATIONS**

B. GENERAL SOURCES OF PERTINENT DATA

Some, but not all, petroleum producing states have well established petroleum regulatory agencies to which production data are reported on a periodic basis, usually monthly. The forms required for reporting in the different states vary widely, and some are much more nearly complete than others. Also, many states now have active air pollution control agencies, and much data on sulfur production and sulfur emissions from petroleum production operations are available from this source. Other general sources of data include trade organizations, manufacturers of equipment or chemicals industry publications and commercial data sources, independent consultants and private correspondence, in addition to the petroleum producers and the gas pipeline companies themselves.

II. OVERALL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A preliminary survey of data sources indicated the feasibility of obtaining meaningful data on sulfur emissions in the United States by the natural gas production industry. This preliminary survey also indicated that there were serious discrepancies as well as wide differences in the total U.S. sulfur emission values for the petroleum production industry as reported in two earlier studies made for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

The major portion of natural gas production industry emissions of sulfur compounds is contributed by natural gas sweetening processes in which hydrogen sulfide is removed from the natural gas. Two large producing areas, the Permian Basin in West Texas and Southeastern New Mexico and the Smackover Formation which runs in a large arc starting south of San Antonio, Texas and following northeasterly along Southern Arkansas and then southeasterly to Jackson, Mississippi and Pensacola, Florida, account for approximately 80 percent of the sulfur emissions from natural gas production operations in the United States. The detailed study was limited to these two areas.

A study of the available data indicates that the emissions of sulfur compounds by the natural gas producing industry from the areas studied were equivalent to 304,000 long tons (309,000 metric tons) of sulfur in 1973. This resulted in emissions to the atmosphere of 664,000 short tons (602,000 metric tons) of sulfur dioxide and 9,000 short tons (8,000 metric tons) of hydrogen sulfide. These results are summarized below: (see Table 5, p. 77 for more detail)

	Total Emissions Reported As Elemental Sulfur	Actual Emissions	
		Sulfur Dioxide	Hydrogen Sulfide
long tons/year	304,000	593,000	8,000
metric tons/year	309,000	603,000	8,000
short tons/year	340,000	664,000	9,000
95 percent confidence limits	± 15%	± 15%	± 15%

Total emissions by the natural gas producing industry in the United States in 1973 are estimated to be equivalent to 408,000 long tons of sulfur (415,000 metric tons) which are equal to 914,000 short tons (829,000 metric tons) of sulfur dioxide. The accuracy of this estimate is plus or minus 24 percent, indicating a range of 695,000 short tons (630,000 metric tons) to 1,133,000 short tons (1,028,000 metric tons). A comparison of the emissions value resulting from the present study with values from the two previous studies is presented on the following page:

Estimated Total Annual Emissions of Sulfur From Natural Gas Producing Operations in the United States

	Reported As Sulfur		Reported As Sulfur Dioxide	
	Long Tons	Metric Tons	Short Tons	Metric Tons
EAI Study	408,000 ± 24%	415,000 ± 24%	914,000 ± 24%	829,000 ± 24%
Battelle Study	48,400	50,000	108,000	100,000
Process Research, Inc.				
Study #1			3,400,000	3,084,000
Study #2			7,340,000	6,659,000

The present study indicates that the weighted average efficiency of the 55 sulfur recovery plants operating in the study area is 85.3 percent. The weighted average was calculated by summing the product of the inlet gas charge to each sweetening plant and its recovery efficiency and dividing the sum by the total amount of gas sweetened. Recovery efficiency drops rapidly as the ratio of hydrogen sulfide to carbon dioxide in the acid gas stream decreases. It will be difficult to maintain a 90 percent recovery efficiency, even with new plants operating on acid gas streams of 80 percent and greater hydrogen sulfide content.

III. PART I - A STUDY TO ASSESS THE OPTIMUM METHOD TO COLLECT DATA

(This section was submitted in August, 1974, at the conclusion of the initial study phase.)

A. SUMMARY

This study was conducted by contacting over thirty organizations including state petroleum and air quality regulatory agencies, trade associations, publications, manufacturers, service companies for the petroleum production industry, petroleum production companies and gas transmission companies. The purpose was to determine an optimum way to obtain data on the emissions of hydrogen sulfide and sulfur dioxide by the petroleum production industry.

The major share of petroleum production industry emissions of sulfur compounds arises from the natural gas sweetening process in which hydrogen sulfide is removed from natural gas. The hydrogen sulfide is vented, flared, reinjected or further processed to make elemental sulfur or commercial products. The 1972 emissions inventory of the petroleum production industry for Texas showed a total of about 300,000 short tons (272,000 metric tons) of sulfur dioxide emissions, virtually all of which result from the combustion of hydrogen sulfide. Based on approximate data, the emissions in Texas are probably between 50 and 65 percent of the total United States emissions by this industry.

There are several other less important sources of sulfur emissions, such as hydrogen sulfide vapors at field crude oil storage tanks, the use of unprocessed gas and the combustion of processed gas. Based on information developed to date, these sources are probably less than 10 percent of those associated with gas treating plants.

The availability of data varies greatly by state. Fortunately, Texas and Wyoming, which probably have over 65 percent of U.S. emissions, have excellent records at both the petroleum and environmental regulatory agencies. Available data for the other states can be compiled and then a telephone survey conducted to resolve discrepancies and fill gaps in information.

B. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This section of the report describes the purpose of the study and the methods that were employed.

1. Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate existing sources of information to determine the optimum way to obtain data on the emissions of sulfur compounds by the natural gas producing and processing and the oil production industries.

2. Methods

Personal interviews were conducted with nearly all individuals contacted. Not only were data obtained, but opinions were solicited on the optimum way to collect data. Below is a listing of the organizations contacted. Detailed contact reports are included in Appendix 8 of this report.

Petroleum Regulatory Agencies

Federal Power Commission
Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission
Louisiana Department of Conservation
Mississippi State Oil & Gas Board
Texas Railroad Commission
Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission

Air Pollution Control Agencies

Colorado Air Pollution Control Division
Louisiana Air Control Commission
Mississippi Air and Water Pollution Control Commission
Texas Air Control Board
Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality

Trade Organizations

American Gas Association
Gas Producers Association
Texas Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association

Manufacturers of Equipment or Chemicals

C-E Natco Company
Ford, Bacon and Davis
Jefferson Chemical (interview refused)
John Zink Company

Publications and Commercial Data Sources

Bureau of Mines, Department of Interior
R. W. Byram & Co.
Oil and Gas Journal
Petroleum Information Corporation

Petroleum Producers and Gas Pipeline Companies

- Amoco Production Co.
- Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co.
- Cities Service Oil Co.
- Exxon Corporation, U.S.A.
- Lone Star Gas
- Phillips Petroleum Co.
- Shell Oil Co.
- Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Corp.
- Transwestern Pipeline Co.
- Trunkline Gas Co.
- United Gas Pipeline
- Warren Petroleum Company

C. EVALUATION OF INFORMATION SOURCES

Visits were made to organizations within eight categories of information sources. Below is an evaluation of each:

1. State Oil and Gas Regulatory Agencies

All states require operators of gas processing plants to file monthly reports. The plant operator provides data on the source of incoming natural gas, the sales or shipments of products and processed gas and the disposition of the remainder or "Residue Gas". These reports are typically filed by the accounting section of the processor's company.

Texas asks for data on hydrogen sulfide and production of sulfur while Wyoming and Mississippi only ask for sulfur production. Louisiana and Colorado have no such requirement because sour gas is either rare or non-existent in these states. Sample report forms are included in the Appendix.

Texas accumulates data on all types of gas processing plants including gasoline, cycling and "other" plants. "Gasoline Plants" are defined as those that produce gasoline (natural gasoline) along with natural gas and other products such as butane, propane and ethane. "Cycling Plants" are associated with gas condensate reservoirs. The produced well stream is separated at relatively high pressure and the vapors are processed for sweetening, if necessary, and removal of normal liquid components. The processed gas is then reinjected to maintain reservoir pressure as near the original pressure as possible. "Other Plants" are those where compression condensate, line drips and similar unfractionated feedstocks for gasoline plants or refineries are separated from wet-gas streams and collected.

In 1972 the Texas Railroad Commission[1] reported the following:

Type of Plant	Total Number of Plants	Annual Sulfur Production (long tons)
Gasoline	340	193,000
Cycling	30	217,000
Other	600	46,000
	970	456,000
Oil & Gas Journal[2]	369	403,000

---

[1] Annual Report of the Oil and Gas Division, 1972. The Railroad Commission of Texas.

[2] "1973 Survey of Gas-Processing Plant", Oil and Gas Journal July 9, 1973, for Texas.

It appears that the Oil & Gas Journal survey includes only the gasoline and cycling plants and omits the "other" plants.

None of the other four states surveyed required reports on the "other" category of plants.

No state collects data on the use of crude oil as a fuel at well sites or in plants, or flared. Only total production data are reported. Also, there are no data collected on the hydrogen sulfide content of crude oil.

2. State Air Control Agencies

All states were required by the Environmental Protection Agency to have emissions inventories prepared as part of their implementation plans. Of the five states surveyed, only Texas has a regular emissions inventory requirement.

Each source is required in Texas to submit data annually on its emissions. The data are processed in a variety of ways, and complete data on 1973 emissions by the petroleum production industry in Texas should be available in October, 1974. (These data are still not available at the completion of the second phase of the study, December, 1974.)

The 1972 inventory as reported to the Texas Air Control Board shows that the emissions of the petroleum production industry total about 300,000 short tons (272,000 metric tons) per year of sulfur dioxide.

There are inconsistencies between the data filed with the Texas Air Control Board (TACB), data filed with the Railroad Commission (RRC) and some of the source testing work done by Ecology Audits, Inc. One reason for the inconsistency between the two state agencies is that the reports are generally prepared by two different individuals in the company. Reports for the TACB are usually prepared by the environmental manager while the RRC reports are furnished by the processor's accounting department.

Many clients of Ecology Audits have been surprised by the higher than expected emissions in stack tests. They relied on plant balances prior to the general usage of stack testing which began in 1973. Sulfur production is easy to measure, but apparently small errors occur in measuring the large volumes of incoming gas or its hydrogen sulfide content. There are several possible explanations.

Sour gas is quite corrosive, and it may damage the orifice plate measuring incoming flow. This would result in erroneously low values of inlet gas flow and indicate high recovery efficiency. Another possible source of error may be that hydrogen sulfide is so chemically active it reacts with the sampling and analytical devices such as sample bombs and tubing in chromatographs. This would also result in understated hydrogen sulfide content of the incoming gas, boost apparent plant efficiency, and understate tail gas incinerator emissions.

Several conclusions may be made. The errors in measuring produced hydrogen sulfide and in estimating the emissions from a sweetening plant without sulfur recovery are likely to be small -- generally less than a 5 percent underestimation. The errors in estimating the stack emissions from sulfur recovery plants by material balance are likely to be much greater, perhaps on the order of underestimating by 15 to 30 percent.

None of the other states surveyed had, in their opinion, reliable and current emission inventories.

3. Trade Organizations

No data collection or processing is done in the industry by the three organizations visited. Hydrogen sulfide has not been studied by the American Gas Association except from the standpoint of corrosion and safety. The Gas Processors Association generally is involved with phase equilibria and enthalpy properties for process design, but it does not accumulate statistical data on production. The Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association acts as a coordinating body for industry committees and does not accumulate statistical production data.

4. Manufacturers of Equipment and Chemicals

Companies in this group were very reluctant to discuss any aspect of their business. By disclosing information about customers, they run two risks: 1) that competitors will find out who their customers are and 2) that their customers may be subjected to an Environmental Protection Agency inquiry. Neither risk has offsetting commercial advantages.

One maker of chemicals said that there was no easy way to get a list of plant operators. The sales manager said that the published directories were of limited help, and that he relied on his long-term relationships with most gas processors to tell him where and when they were planning their next plants. In short, he confirmed the essence of this study, that there is no easy or simple way to find out by whom and where gas sweetening is taking place.

5. Publications/Commerical Data Sources

The Oil & Gas Journal does an annual survey of gas-processing plants. This survey is voluntary and most firms respond. Below is a tabulation of the plants reported to the petroleum regulatory agencies and the Oil & Gas Journal:

	Gas Processing Plants Reported To	
State	Petroleum Regulatory Agency	Oil & Gas Journal
Colorado	17	12
Louisiana	169	132
Mississippi	14	10
Texas*	370	369
Wyoming	33	27
Other States	358**	236
Texas "Other"	600	--
U.S. Total	1561	786

---

* Includes only gasoline and cycling plants. "Other" plants are excluded.

** Estimates based on ratio of underreporting in Colorado, Louisiana, Mississippi and Wyoming.

It appears that the coverage for Texas is good if only because the format of the Oil & Gas Journal report is similar to that of the Texas Railroad Commission. Data for the other states shows that the Oil & Gas Journal survey covers 75 to 80 percent of the gasoline plants. If this ratio applies elsewhere then there should be about 358 plants in these states. This and the 600 "other" Texas plants suggests a U.S. total of 1561 plants.

Starting in 1974, the Oil & Gas Journal modified their questionnaire specifically to request data on sulfur production. Until then many, but not all, sulfur producers voluntarily listed sulfur production in the "other" category.

The Bureau of Mines, U.S. Department of the Interior, publishes a monthly and annual report of sulfur production as part of its Mineral Industry Surveys. Their mailing list for sulfur recovery plants is derived from the Oil & Gas Journal report. This survey covers only sulfur recovery plants, and no data on individual plants can be made available because of departmental disclosure rules. The Bureau of Mines list of plants can provide a useful check to verify data obtained from state regulatory agencies.

Below is a comparison of the Bureau of Mines report and the Oil & Gas Journal Report. It shows that many firms responding to the Oil & Gas Journal survey did not include their sulfur production.

Comparison of Data - Gas Processing Plants
Recovering Sulfur, 1972 Shipments and Capacity

State	Bureau of Mines		Oil & Gas Journal	
	Number of Plants**	Shipments (1000 long tons)* 1972	Number of Plants	Capacity (1000 long tons)
Alabama	1	*	--	--
Arkansas	2	*	1	2
Florida	1	92	--	--
Mississippi	2	*	2	80
New Mexico	6	35	2	11
North Dakota	2	*	1	42
Oklahoma	1	1	--	--
Texas	36	*	20	403
Wyoming	4	40	2	37
	55		28	575

* Data only reported for those states where all recovered sulfur is made in gas processing plants.

** The number of plants is based on the current Bureau of Mines list of plants which was annotated on about June 15, 1974, by Roland W. Merwin and sent to the author.

Several firms summarize data filed with the oil and gas regulatory agencies and make it available on a fee basis. Petroleum Information, a subsidiary of A. C. Nielson Company, has some of the data computerized, but there are gaps in material extracted from the reports.

6. Petroleum Production and Gas Transmission Companies

All of the major petroleum companies were anxious to cooperate. In general, they are not enthusiastic over additional reports so they want all existing data currently available to the public to be summarized. All expressed a desire to cooperate with a survey of facilities in states where there is limited public data available.

The gas transmission firms fell into two categories: those that were cooperative and several that almost refused to answer any question. It appears that their reluctance to provide information stems from their tight regulation by the Federal Power Commission and by the barrage of surveys and reports resulting from the energy crisis.

7. Service Company Data

a. Compositions of Oil and Gas Well Production

Generalized data on approximately 2,000 reports of reservoir fluids studied over a 35 month period were examined. Samples from wells in the United States numbered 856 and of these 158 (18.5 percent) showed hydrogen sulfide, ranging between 0.01 and 49.0 mol percent. The lower limit of the content reported is 0.01 mol percent (approximately 6 grains per 100 cubic feet), which is governed by the analytical accuracy of the instruments. No data are contained in these reports on the potential or current production rate of the wells.

Generally, sour reservoirs are tested much more extensively than sweet reservoirs because of the problems associated with handling hydrogen sulfide. It is not correct, therefore, to conclude that 18 percent of new reservoirs contain sour gases.

It also appears that after testing, some well owners have sold their interests to others or found the wells uneconomical to produce. Data more than 10 years old, therefore, is probably of limited value in identifying owners of sour production.

Similar data may be obtained for an additional 4,000 to 4,500 studies made during the past ten years, of which about 350 to 400 may be expected to contain sour gas. There will be significant duplication since well owners frequently have the original well and nearby development wells tested.

All of the specific well data are confidential, but the generalized data can be used to identify areas where hydrogen sulfide exists.

b. Ambient Air and Stack Monitoring

Since its founding in 1967, Ecology Audits has conducted ambient air studies at 43 sites at or near petroleum production facilities. In addition, it has conducted 34 stack tests on sulfur recovery plant incinerators for sulfur dioxide and, in some cases, for hydrogen sulfide.

Much of these data were obtained to aid firms in determining their compliance status and, in many cases, new equipment has been installed to control emissions. Another trend is the reduction in emissions as operators learn more about the operating characteristics of their plants.

All the specific data are confidential, but the generalized summaries may be used to identify areas where emissions of sulfur compounds exist.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ESTIMATING EMISSIONS FROM THE PETROLEUM PRODUCTION INDUSTRY

Based on analysis of the information that is available, Ecology Audits proposes to carry out a study as presented below:

1. Scope of Work

Ecology Audits proposes to conduct a study whereby the quantity and disposition of hydrogen sulfide contained in natural gas produced in the year 1973 from the Permian Basin and the Smackover Formation will be estimated. Information provided on the disposition of this hydrogen sulfide will include data on venting, flaring, incinerating, conversion into elemental sulfur, and reinjection.

2. Methods

a. Source of Emissions

Emissions of hydrogen sulfide and sulfur dioxide can come from a variety of sources. The letter by each source indicates the section to be found in the next following pages in which these emissions are discussed.

Hydrogen Sulfide	b.	vented from gas sweetening plants
	b.	emitted by low-temperature (700-1200°F) tail gas incinerators operating on sulfur recovery plants
	d.	emitted by carbon black plants using sour gas as a feedstock
	c.	vented unprocessed natural gas
		released by sour crude stored in tanks without vapor recovery (not included in this study)
Sulfur Dioxide	b.	released by flares and/or incinerators at gas sweetening plants
	b.	released by flares or incinerators fed by tail gases from sulfur recovery plants or plants making chemicals containing sulfur
	d.	released by users of sour gas such as power plants
	c.	flared or burned unprocessed natural gas
		released by the burning of sour crude in heaters located at plant and well sites (not included in this study)
		released by users of commercial grade natural gas (not included in this study)

In rare cases hydrogen sulfide is reinjected with other gases to maintain reservoir pressure. The difficulties in handling hydrogen sulfide preclude widespread reinjection if any other gases are available.

b. **Emissions of Gas Sweetening and Sulfur Recovery Plants**

This group of sources is probably responsible for over 90 percent of the total emissions. All available data will be assembled on a county basis.

Analysis sheets will be prepared for each county known to produce sour gas. All available information from state agencies, publications and service company sources will be compared and analyzed. Inconsistencies will be identified and phone calls made to the producer to resolve these. Some personal visits will be required to both Austin and Santa Fe and possibly other state capitols.

Special attention will be given sulfur recovery plants, injection systems and producers selling tail gases to chemical companies for further processing.

c. Emissions From Flaring, Burning or Venting of Unprocessed Sour Natural Gas

The amount of gas reported to the state agencies as vented or flared is less than 0.5% of total gas production. Data on the emissions from the burning or venting of unprocessed sour natural gas only will be obtained to determine the accuracy of these values. The following procedure will be used:

The gross production into each gathering system will be determined along with the receipts by gas plants. The difference is assumed to be used, in an unprocessed state, on the lease and will be considered to be as sour as the average produced gas in the county.

d. Miscellaneous Sources of Sulfur Dioxide and Hydrogen Sulfide

For many years sour natural gas has been used as a feedstock for carbon black plants. The process results in the emissions of some hydrogen sulfide which will be estimated as part of the study.

There is also at least one power plant that has been reported that burns sour natural gas. This plant and other industrial users of sour natural gas will be studied.

Excellent data are available in Texas where it has been estimated that between 50 and 65 percent of the emissions occur. Field survey work will probably be required in some other states.

3. Report

A draft report will be prepared discussing the industry, the sources of emissions and the methods used to collect the data. Tabular summaries of data collected for the Permian Basin and the Smackover Formation will be broken down by County, AQCR and State. The summaries will show:

a. Production of hydrogen sulfide along with natural gas by county in the study areas.

b. Production of elemental sulfur and other products in sulfur equivalents from plants using by-products of gas processing plants as feedstock.

c. Emissions of hydrogen sulfide and sulfur dioxide occurring at field operations including:

1.) use or venting of unprocessed gas

2.) disposal of tail gases from sweetening operations

3.) tail gas incineration associated with sulfur recovery and sulfur products production operations

4.) operation of non-petroleum facilities using natural gas not meeting usual pipeline standards

d. Shipment of hydrogen sulfide along with sweetened natural gas to pipeline customers.

e. Typical range of hydrogen sulfide content of natural gas by county in the areas studied and calculated average concentrations by county based on the hydrogen sulfide analyses.

f. Estimate of the degree of accuracy of the data reported on a county-by-county basis.

Detailed information will be provided on the data sources and the methods used to estimate data.

The final report will include:

I. Summary

II. Purpose and Methods

III. Description of Facilities and Processes, Including a Flow Sheet

IV. Statistical Summaries of Data for the Two Study Areas

V. Summary of Information in Other Areas

Appendices

A. Contact Reports
B. Copies of Important Statistical Source Material
C. Glossary of Terms

4. Time Schedule for Project

The accompanying bar chart indicates the approximate time allocation and the dates for completion of the various phases of the proposed study.

SCHEDULE OF WORK



IV. PART II - COLLECTION OF DATA AND EVALUATION OF SULFUR COMPOUND EMISSIONS

A. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The emissions of sulfur compounds by the natural gas producing industry from the Permian Basin and Smackover Formation in 1973 were equivalent to 304,000 long tons of sulfur. This resulted in emissions to the atmosphere of 664,000 short tons of sulfur dioxide and 9,000 short tons of hydrogen sulfide. These data are estimated to be accurate to within plus or minus 15 percent.

2. The emissions by the natural gas producing industry in the United States but outside of the study area are estimated to be equivalent to 104,000 long tons of sulfur. The accuracy of this estimate is plus or minus 50 percent.

3. The emissions by the natural gas producing industry in the United States in 1973 are estimated to be equivalent to 408,000 long tons of sulfur which is equal to 914,000 short tons of sulfur dioxide. The accuracy of this estimate is plus or minus 24 percent. Emissions could be as high as 1,133,000 or as low as 695,000 short tons of sulfur dioxide in 1973.

4. In the study area about 33 percent of all gas produced was processed for the removal of hydrogen sulfide. This volume represents about 14.4 percent of total U.S. production of natural gas. It is likely that about 19 percent of all U.S. gas production is treated for hydrogen sulfide removal. The gas production in the study area, therefore, represents approximately 76 percent of the natural gas which is processed in the U.S. for the removal of hydrogen sulfide.

5. The weighted average recovery efficiency of the 55 sulfur recovery plants fed by natural gas in the study area is 85.3 percent. Even the newest three stage plants have difficulty maintaining 90 percent recovery efficiency on acid gas streams containing over 80 percent hydrogen sulfide. Recovery efficiency drops rapidly as the ratio of hydrogen sulfide to carbon dioxide in the acid gas stream decreases.

6. The reports of the Texas Railroad Commission show that 9.6 billion cubic feet of produced sour gas was either vented or used as lease fuel in 1973. This activity resulted in minor emissions: 1233 long tons of sulfur per year, or less than one-third of one percent of total sulfur intake to sweetening plants. The data for other states, had they been available, are likely to show a similar ratio.

B. PURPOSE AND METHODS

1. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to perform an investigation of existing sources whereby the quantity and disposition of hydrogen sulfide contained in natural gas produced in the year 1973 from the Permian Basin and the Smackover Formation will be estimated. Information provided on the disposition of this hydrogen sulfide will include data on reinjection, recovery as elemental sulfur and emissions from venting, flaring, and incinerating.

2. Sources of Information

This section describes the sources of public information concerning the oil and gas production industry. The first subsection discusses the data collected by national organizations. Subsequent parts discuss the data available in each state.

a. General Sources

1.) Oil & Gas Journal

The Oil & Gas Journal (Petroleum Publishing Company, Tulsa, Oklahoma) makes an annual survey of natural gas processing plants. The survey is voluntary and most firms respond.

Table 1 presents comparative data on the number of plants that reported data to the Oil & Gas Journal with plants reporting to the respective petroleum regulatory agencies for the states studied.

Because of the different reporting rules among the states, data in Table 1 should be used only as an approximate guide. In Texas, for example, some gas processing plants do not make reports to the state agency because they produce no hydrocarbon liquids. Reports of the gas sweetening plants in the Jay Field of Florida were made to the state agency, even though the recovered liquids are recombined with field crude. These plants were not included in the Oil & Gas Journal survey.

TABLE 1

	Gas Processing Plants Reported To	
State	Petroleum Regulatory Agency	Oil & Gas Journal
Alabama	3	1
Arkansas	4	3
Florida	5	1
Louisiana*	147	124
Mississippi	14	9
Southeastern New Mexico	33	24
Texas**	366	301
(Texas)	(575)	(70)

---

*The Petroleum Regulatory Agency column contains 37 plants not responding to the Oil & Gas Journal survey while the Oil & Gas Journal column includes 14 plants not on the state mailing list.

**Includes gasoline and cycling plants. "Other" plants are indicated by parenthesis ( ) and include sulfur recovery plants, drip stations and plants that produce an unseparated blend of natural gas liquids.

The Oil & Gas Journal data for states covers about 75 to 80 percent of the gasoline plants, but only a small fraction of other gas processing units such as sweetening and dehydration facilities. Although the questionnaire requested data on sulfur production, only about 33 of the plants provided this information. No data is provided on the hydrogen sulfide gas losses of each plant.

2.) Bureau of Mines

The Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior collects and reports United States sulfur production. The data is reported by state, but several states are combined where necessary to avoid disclosing the production of individual operators.

Mr. Roland Merwin (703/557-0495) provided Ecology Audits a list of all sulfur recovery plants in the United States and indicated which of these were at sites of natural gas processing plants.

Under departmental rules, the data furnished by companies is treated in confidence except that it may be disclosed to Federal Defense Agencies.

3.) Service Company Data

a.) Well Stream Data

Data contained in 5981 reports of reservoir fluid studies made by a world-wide service company during a 10-year period from 1964 to 1973 were examined. Of these, 2304 reports represent reservoirs in all of the major producing areas in the United States, including 265 reports (11.5 percent) on petroleum containing some hydrogen sulfide.

Since all of the reservoir study data are confidential, the generalized qualitative data were used only to identify areas where hydrogen sulfide exists. No data are contained in these reports on the potential or current production rate of the wells.

The lower limit of content reported is 0.01 mol percent (approximately 6 grains per 100 standard cubic feet) which is governed by the analytical accuracy of the instruments. Any content below 0.01 mol percent is reported as a trace or zero.

Generally, sour reservoirs are tested more extensively than sweet reservoirs because of the problems associated with handling hydrogen sulfide. In addition, there tended to be more samples analyzed in the case of sour petroleum reservoirs per report; therefore, a conclusion that 11.5 percent of reservoirs contain hydrogen sulfide would not be correct.

b.) Ambient Air and Stack Monitoring

Since its founding in 1967, Ecology Audits has conducted ambient air studies at 43 sites at or near petroleum production facilities. In addition, it has conducted 35 stack tests on sulfur recovery plants and acid gas incinerators.

Most of this data was used by clients to determine their compliance status. In many cases new equipment has been installed to control emissions. As in the case of reservoir studies, all test data is confidential, but it can be used to identify areas where sulfur dioxide and hydrogen sulfide emissions occur.

b. New Mexico

1.) New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission

Monthly reports are made by all gas processing plant operators on Form C-111 (See Appendix). No data is collected on acid gas or hydrogen sulfide. Information on the 33 facilities, including 30 extraction plants, located in Southeastern New Mexico was obtained from the New Mexico Oil and Gas Engineering Committee, P. O. Box 127, Hobbs, New Mexico.

The data includes plant intake, plant fuel use, lease use, sales, reinjection, shrinkage and vented gas.

2.) New Mexico Environmental Improvement Agency

The Air Quality Section provided a listing of plants with estimated emissions of sulfur dioxide of 25 tons per year or more. The list was compiled in 1971 for the year 1970 by an EPA contractor assisting the state in the preparation of its implementation plan. State officials expressed their reservations regarding the list, and Ecology Audits confirmed that there were some omissions. Subsequently, the state provided data on selected plants for which emissions data had been submitted by plant operators.

c. Texas

1.) The Railroad Commission of Texas, Oil and Gas Division
All operators of gasoline plants, cycling plants or any facility which produces or collects liquids is required to file information monthly on Form GP-1. Data is collected on hydrogen sulfide, although many operators report total acid gas (hydrogen sulfide and carbon dioxide) as hydrogen sulfide.

Where operators do provide information on the composition of acid gas, it is from ratios given to the operator's accounting department by process engineers. Unfortunately, the engineers sometimes do not keep the accountants up-to-date on changes in acid gas composition which occur as new wells are drilled and old wells cease production.

All reports for 1973 were reviewed, and if hydrogen sulfide loss was reported, the following data were collected:

-- hydrogen sulfide loss

-- sulfur production

-- total plant intake

-- unprocessed gas used in the fuel system or on a lease

-- vented unprocessed gas

A total of 99 facilities have some reported hydrogen sulfide out of a total of 941 facilities (10.5 percent). This is not a complete list of all potential sources of sulfur compound emissions because plants which do not collect liquids, such as sweetening facilities or sulfur recovery plants, are not required to report to the Commission.

2.) The Texas Air Control Board

For the past three years the Texas Air Control Board has sent out questionnaires to all plants in the state which emit 50 or more tons of pollutants annually. The data for 1973 was extracted from their working papers for 173 facilities, many of which have emissions less than 50 tons per year of sulfur dioxide. Although these data are more comprehensive, the emission reports are estimates which are subject to possible error in calculation methods.

3.) Texas Comptrollers Office

Texas has a severence tax on sulfur, and this office furnished copies of quarterly production reports by the 35 sulfur plants in the state paying taxes. There are six more plants in the state that apparently are not aware of their potential tax liability.

d. Arkansas

1.) State of Arkansas Oil and Gas Commission

Mr. Lynn Fite of this agency provided production and operating statistics on the four gas processing plants located in Arkansas. No data is collected on acid gas or hydrogen sulfide. Mr. Fite also commented on some specific sour gas wells by indicating that these had been plugged or that production was initiated from sweet zones.

Arkansas is a leading producer of elemental Bromine. The feedstock for these plants is from saline aquifers which are tapped in the same manner as petroleum reservoirs. These aquifers often contain high levels of hydrogen sulfide. No attempt was made to assess the emissions from these facilities because it is outside the scope of the study.

2.) Arkansas Department of Pollution Control and Ecology

Several requests have been made of this agency, but no letter has been received as of the date of this report. The Department did confirm that the data developed in this study for Arkansas is essentially correct.

e. Louisiana

1.) Louisiana Department of Conservation

Monthly reports are required of all gasoline and cycling plants on Form R-6. No data is collected on either acid gas or hydrogen sulfide. Officials with the agency said there may be isolated sour gas flares in Louisiana, but only the regional directors would have information. The agency furnished a copy of their mailing list of firms submitting monthly reports. Contact was made with all six district managers and the only sour gas flares were located in the Southeastern part of the state, several hundred miles from the Smackover Formation.

2.) Louisiana Air Control Commission

The technical secretary of the Commission knew of no amine treating units in the state. He provided the names of individuals in industry who might provide some assistance. It was his opinion that the problems associated with the natural gas industry are very minor compared to the other problems in the state.

f. Mississippi

1.) Mississippi State Oil and Gas Board

Monthly reports are made by all gas processing plant operators on Form 11-10CC G-9 (See Appendix 3.) Data is required on acid gas in section III of this report. Copies of reports furnished by the four plants that report acid gas losses were obtained and summarized.

2.) Mississippi Air and Water Pollution Control Commission

Several requests have been made of this agency, but no letter has been received as of the date of this report.

3.) Region IV Environmental Protection Agency

This region has been requesting firms to submit information on emissions. Ms. Carolyn Heller (404/526-3286) provided copies of reports furnished by seven operators in Mississippi. This program is relatively new and not all sources have been asked to submit data as of the date of this report.

g. Alabama

1.) State Oil and Gas Board

Mr. Donald B. Moore provided copies of the monthly data on petroleum activities in Alabama. During 1973, one gasoline plant and one gas sweetening plant operated in Alabama. Three more plants commenced operations in 1974. Although no data are collected on hydrogen sulfide, it did furnish test reports in their files on two sour gas fields.

Gas produced on the Alabama side of the Jay and Little Escambia Creek Fields is treated at the Wiggin's Lake facility located just across the state line in Florida.

2.) Alabama Air Pollution Control Commission

Mr. James W. Cooper, Director, provided data on the emissions of the two plants in the state, only one of which operated in 1973.

h. Florida

1.) Division of Interior Resources, Bureau of Geology

Mr. Charles Hendly provided copies of monthly reports for the four gas treating plants located in Northwestern Florida. These plants remove the hydrogen sulfide from the casinghead gas. A gasoline plant is currently under construction. No data are collected on hydrogen sulfide, but most producers do show their recovered sulfur production.

2.) Department of Pollution Control

Mr. Henry Sobala, Regional Manager of far Northwest Florida, sent copies of all test reports furnished to his department by the Jay Field plant operators.

3. Analysis of Data

a. Data Analysis Sheets

All available data from public sources were entered on a data sheet. A copy of the type of data sheet used in tabulating the data is included in Appendix 4 as sheet No. 1.

The heading shows the state and the counties within the state. The left stub provides information on the company and field and/or plant as appropriate.

Service Company information was used to provide an indication of the presence of sour gas. G/O is an indication that the analysis is for Gas or Oil. W/S indicated a well stream analysis. The hydrogen sulfide content of sour gas varies with the pressure in the separator, so only in general terms could the reservoir fluid analysis be used to indicate the hydrogen sulfide content of the gas stream going to a processing plant.

Air Agency refers to information provided by the State Air Control Agency. All reported emissions were reduced to long tons of sulfur.

$$SO_2 \text{ tons per year X } \underset{(.4464)}{\frac{32}{64} \text{ X } \frac{2000}{2240}} - \text{ long tons sulfur per year}$$

$$H_2S \text{ tons per year X } \underset{(.8403)}{\frac{32}{34} \text{ X } \frac{2000}{2240}} = \text{ long tons sulfur per year}$$

Only Texas had up-to-date emissions information on this industry.

Oil and Gas Journal data was extracted from their 1973 report. The daily "capacity" in long tons per day was multiplied by 365 to obtain annual data. Comparisons of the data indicate that "production" rather than "capacity" was reported in many cases.

The Bureau of Mines provided a list of all known sulfur plants. A plant on their list is indicated by an "X". In the lower space data reported to the Texas Comptroller's office in long tons of sulfur per year is recorded.

Data for Gas Processing Plants were obtained from each state agency. The first column shows the total plant throughput in millions of cubic feet for the year. Where reported, the "hydrogen sulfide" extraction loss appears in the next column. In many cases the "hydrogen sulfide" number is actually the metered acid gas volume from the amine regenerator and includes carbon dioxide and some hydrocarbons.

The "hydrogen sulfide" loss is reduced to long tons of sulfur as follows:

1 lb. mol = 359.05 cubic feet at 32°F, 14.7 psia

Molecular weight of hydrogen sulfide = 34

Molecular weight of sulfur = 32

Standard reporting conditions to Texas Railroad Commission: 60°F, 14.65 psia

One long ton = 2240 pounds

Calculate the cubic feet per pound under TRRC conditions:

$$\frac{359.05}{34} \times \frac{460 + 60}{460 + 32} \times \frac{14.70}{14.65} = 11.21 \text{ cubic feet per pound of hydrogen sulfide}$$

Calculate the tons of sulfur per million cubic feet of hydrogen sulfide:

$$\frac{1{,}000{,}000}{11.20} \times \frac{1}{2240} \times \frac{32}{34} = 37.48 \text{ long tons sulfur per MMCFH}_2\text{S}$$

Some operators reported the H_2S content of their produced gas in terms of grains per 100 standard cubic feet. To calculate the tons of sulfur per million cubic feet of gas containing one grain of H_2S per 100 standard cubic feet, the following calculation is used:

1MMCF = 10,000 grains of hydrogen sulfide

7,000 grains = 1 pound

$$\frac{10{,}000}{7{,}000} \times \frac{32}{34} \times \frac{1}{2240} = .000600 \text{ long tons sulfur per MMCF with 1 grain } H_2S \text{ content}$$

The average "H_2S" content is calculated by dividing the "H_2S loss" by the total plant intake.

Sulfur production is based on data reported to the petroleum regulatory agency.

Data on unprocessed gas obtained from the state regulatory agency are recorded in the next column. Both fuel use and vented gas are reported. Then, using the same average hydrogen sulfide content as the inlet gas to the plant, the hydrogen sulfide losses are calculated and converted into emissions of long tons of sulfur.

The data were then transferred to another data sheet, one for each facility. This data form is included in Appendix 4, Sheet No. 2. These sheets were mailed to the operators of several plants for their comments. Those who operate only one or two plants were contacted by telephone to verify the data.

Included in Appendix 6 is M. W. Kellogg's Evaluation of the Assumptions, Methods, and Results used in this section of the report.

b. Analytical Methods

There are several methods that can be used to analyze a gas treating facility. Below are some methods used in the preparation of this report.

1.) Sulfur recovered analysis

Calculate the ratio between plant intake and recovered sulfur. If the plant is fed by a single field of similar gas wells, the ratio should remain constant. Typically, the gas plant intake will show a reasonably uniform monthly flow except for periodic dips. The recovery rate will usually show declines each month until the plant is shut down (the reason for the dip in monthly intake) and the catalyst bed in the sulfur recovery unit is renewed after which the recovery rate peaks again. Below is data for a sulfur recovery plant which illustrates this:

TABLE 2

Month	Gas Production MMCF	Sulfur Recovered LT/mo.	Ratio LT/mo. per MMCF
January	339	712	2.10
February	234	813	3.47
March	720	2,576	3.58
April	685	2,451	3.58
May	712	2,307	3.24
June	786	2,247	2.86
July	800	1,705	2.13
August	696	979	1.41
September	680	514	.76
October	0	0	--
November	781	2,785	3.57
December	897	1,997	2.23
TOTAL	7,330	19,086	2.60

One can readily see that catalyst beds were changed in January and early February and again in October. The decrease in catalyst efficiency is clearly observed in the ratio column. If the plant claims it is 95 percent efficient, one can set the ratio of the best or second-best month equal to 95 and then get a rough idea of the efficiency for the other months. In this case assume that 3.57 is 95 percent, then the annual average efficiency is 69.2%.

$$\text{Annual average efficiency} = \frac{2.60}{3.57}(.95) = 69.2\%$$

The efficiency for each month can also be calculated. This method is only valid if the incoming well stream is uniform.

2.) Unknown acid gas stream

For some plants data on sales gas is known but the amount of hydrogen sulfide in the incoming gas stream is not available. If the operator has furnished a plant material balance based on actual experience, calculations can be made to determine the mols of acid gas in the plant inlet gas stream. The mols of water are subtracted and dry mols of acid gas determined. Since mols are directly proportional to volume, the hydrogen sulfide can be calculated on a dry basis for the incoming gas stream. Below is an illustration of the method :

TABLE 3

SAMPLE MATERIAL BALANCE

	Acid Gas		
	lbs.	mols	Sweet Gas
H_2S	276,828	8,142	--
CO_2	80,696	1,834	--
H_2O	12,546	697	--
CH_4	224	14	
C_2H_6	151	5	
C_3H_8	176	4	
Total Wet Basis	370,621	10,696	1,039,949
Total Dry Basis		9,999	
Volume (MMCF)	4,072		17,335
Volume (dry)	3,807		

Acid gas is $\frac{3,807}{3,807 + 17,335} = 18.0\%$

H_2S in feed is $\left(\frac{3,807}{3,807 + 17,335}\right)\left(\frac{8,142}{9,999}\right) = 14.7\%$

c. Survey Information

There were far more public data available on plants located in Texas than on plants located in the other six states. Plants in Texas accounted for about 75 percent of the facilities studied.

When all public data was assembled for Texas plants, there were discrepancies in the great majority. The discrepancies for other states were significantly less, if only for the fact that less data were publicly available.

Copies of the individual data sheets on each plant were mailed to most multi-plant operators.

Then all operators, both single and multi-plant, were contacted by telephone and asked to comment on the data and verify the emissions data. Confirming information was obtained from more than 99 percent of the more than 200 plant operators contacted.

Among the reasons for the discrepancies are:

- The Railroad Commission data were incorrect because some operators reported their acid gas loss as "H_2S loss". In other cases, the operator's accounting department was using a stream analysis made several years ago to divide the metered acid gas stream into H_2S and CO_2 components. As reservoir pressure changes and as new wells feed a plant, significant compositional changes occur in acid gas. In some cases, operators merely neglected to fill in some data, such as sulfur produced, for some months.

- The Air Control Board data was in error frequently because of various reporting practices. Some operators merely annualized their stack test data. This is a poor practice because most operators "tune" their plants and take special operating precautions to "pass" stack tests. After the test is complete, these standards are relaxed. As a result, stack tests are rarely indicative of long-term emission levels.

  Other operators merely assumed that their plant was 95 or 96 percent efficient and reported emissions as 5 or 4 percent, respectively, of their elemental sulfur recovery. There appear to be some cases where operators figured out their allowable emissions and reported actual emissions at some arbitrary, slightly smaller number.

There were also operators who simply confessed that they had made mathematical errors in their calculations.

In discussing the reports with the operators, Ecology Audits sometimes felt that some operators reaffirmed emission data that was much too low. This often occurred where there have been or are currently court suits or hearings. In about 10 percent of the cases the operator did not care to take the time to investigate the discrepancies. In these cases, Ecology Audits tabulated both the operator's estimate and then made its own estimate, based on what, in some cases, is confidential data.

One of the conclusions of this study is that the use of infrequent stack test data to show annualized plant efficiency has limited value if used alone. Much more reliable data can be obtained by analyzing and developing a material balance for the incoming gas, the acid gas, the sales gas streams and sulfur recovery. Meters are almost always installed on these vapor lines to measure flow continuously. Daily data are also obtained on sulfur recovered. Periodic checks of stream compositions by on-site analytical techniques and sulfur recovery, together with occasional stack tests, provide data for both optimum and long-term emissions evaluation.

4. Other Reports for EPA on this Subject

The Environmental Protection Agency has purchased two prior studies on the industry. During 1972 a study was made by Processes Research, Inc., and during 1974 a study was conducted by Battelle Columbus Laboratories.

a. Processes Research, Inc. Study

The results of this work were reported in two publications:

"Sulfur Dioxide from Natural Gas Fields," July 21, 1972 conducted under Task Order No. 20 Contract No. CPA 70-1.

"Screening Report Crude Oil and Natural Gas Production Processes," December 27, 1972 conducted under Task Order No. 13, Contract No. 68-02-0242.

The first report comments on the fact that very little data is available in the public records on the sulfur content of natural gas. The author assumes that the emissions come from three sources: sulfur recovery plants were assumed to emit sulfur (as sulfur dioxide) in an amount equal to 10 percent of sulfur recovered. Then it was assumed that about 20 percent of all gas produced was sour and contained 400 grains per 100 scf (0.64 mol percent). The acid gases from these plants were assumed to be flared. Finally, it was assumed that the balance of natural gas contained 20 grains of sulfur per 100 standard cubic feet of gas.

All three assumptions are considerably in error. First, most sulfur recovery plants do not operate, or at least did not operate in 1970, at 90 percent recovery efficiency. Second, the occurrence of sour natural gas varies widely but in no instance is it as high as was assumed. Finally, it was found in the first phase of this study that well over 95 percent of the total sulfur in natural gas occurs as hydrogen sulfide and this compound is usually limited by the pipelines to 0.25 grains per 100 scf. The reported conclusion that total sulfur dioxide emissions from natural gas producing operations totals 3.4 million tons is a vast overstatement and is unsupported by data of either industry or regulatory bodies.

The second report uses a slightly different set of assumptions. It assumes that all the 20.7 trillion cubic feet of gas marketed contained, when produced, 0.5 mol percent of sulfur. It was estimated that of the 3.88 million long tons of sulfur produced, 686,000 long tons are recovered. The remainder is emitted, some as hydrogen sulfide and the major portion as sulfur dioxide from the burning of natural gas. The report arrives at the conclusion that annual emissions of sulfur are 7.34 million short tons as sulfur dioxide. This includes 7.15 million short tons related to marketed gas and 190,000 short tons from vented and flared gas.

The assumption concerning the sulfur content of natural gas fails to recognize that most natural gas contains no sulfur. The assumptions are also at variance with a tabulation of gas processing plants contained on pages 32 to 42 in their report.

b. Battelle Columbus Laboratories Study

The results of this work were reported in "Characterization of Sulfur Recovery in Oil and Natural Gas Production", August 28, 1974, under Task 6, Contract No. 68-02-0611.

The report relies heavily on the data in the Oil and Gas Journal survey for 1972. It assumes that sulfur recovery plants have an efficiency of 95 percent and that the annual emissions of sulfur is 50,000 metric tons per year (100,000 metric tons of sulfur dioxide). The author noted the availability of data from the Railroad Commission in Texas, but did not attempt to analyze it because so many firms report acid gas as "H_2S loss".

The conclusions of this report greatly understate emissions. First, the Oil & Gas Journal reported on only 20 of the 40 plants in Texas. Further, the results of the present study indicate sulfur recovery efficiency of approximately 85.3 percent rather than the 95 percent assumed in the report. The report also does not analyze the emissions from numerous plants where the acid gas is flared and sulfur not recovered.

C. SUMMARY OF EMISSIONS FOR STUDY AREA

1. Study Areas

The study covers all or parts of seven states where gas production from the Permian Basin and the Smackover Formation is encountered. These include Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama, and parts of Southeastern New Mexico and Western Florida. No sour gas was located in Northern Louisiana, so this state will be excluded. Also excluded were air quality control regions (AQCR) where there were no reported sour gas production. Table 4 summarizes the AQCRs where emissions of sulfur compounds were found. Appendix 5 contains data and methods of computing values for Table 4.

Table 4 shows that in the study area 1,304,000 long tons of sulfur was produced in 1973 in the form of hydrogen sulfide along with natural gas. Of this amount 1,000,000 long tons were recovered and 304,000 long tons were emitted to the atmosphere, normally in the form of sulfur dioxide. All of the sulfur recovery plants incinerate their tail gas streams and virtually all gas sweetening plants burn their acid gas streams through either flaring or incineration. Many firms that burn their acid gas (hydrogen sulfide and carbon dioxide) streams erroneously report the total as emissions of hydrogen sulfide. Ecology Audits estimates the emissions and their accuracy in Table 5.

Reproduced from best available copy.

TABLE [illegible]

Natural [illegible] Production for Air Quality Control Regions [illegible] Study Area

AQCR	Location	No. of Plants	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
155 (NM)	Pecos Permian Basin	30	590	587	100	0.49%	0.49%	108	48	60
218 (TX)	Midland-Odessa San Angelo	81	2726	1801	66**	0.55%	0.23%	236	126	110
211 (TX)	Amarillo Lubbock	23	1359	530	39**	0.20%	0.08%	40	22	18
217 (TX)	San Antonio	8	159	76	48	1.65%	0.79%	47	34	13
215 210 212 214 (TX)	Dallas-Ft. Worth Abilene-Wichita Falls-Austin- Waco-Corpus Christi	10	2456	56	2	3.63%	0.08%	77	62	15
213 216 (TX)	Brownsville- Laredo-Houston Galveston SE Texas	--	2213	--	0			--	--	--
22 (TX) (AR)	Shreveport- Texarkana-Tyler	14	459	129	28	7.50%	2.10%	362	314	48
5 (MS,AL FL)	Mobile-Pensacola Panama City Southern Miss.	14	165	71	43	16.2%	7.03%	434	394	40
Total (excluding "other Texas")		180	7914	3250	41**	1.07 %	0.44%	1304	1000	304
Total Study Area			10127		32**		0.34%			

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.
**Approximation - see text

Table 5

Emissions of Sulfur Compounds in the Study Area

	Total Emissions Reported As Elemental Sulfur	Actual Emissions	
		Sulfur Dioxide	Hydrogen Sulfide
long tons/year	304,000	593,000	8,000
metric tons/year	309,000	603,000	8,000
short tons/year	340,000	664,000	9,000
95 percent confidence limits	± 15%	± 15%	± 50%

(Emissions from Claus plant tail gasses are approximately 172,000 long tons per year of elemental sulfur or 344 long tons per year of SO_2 [see Table 6, p. 83] and this is included in these totals.)

The Texas Railroad Commission publishes data monthly and annually on the disposition of produced natural gas. Based on this study, hydrogen sulfide is about 11 percent of the acid gas loss as reported in Table 8 of their recent annual reports (see Appendix 3). This is equal to 20 billion cubic feet per year, or about 750,000 long tons of sulfur, equivalent to 58 percent of the hydrogen sulfide produced in the study area.

2. Facilities Studied

A total of 261 plants were studied, of which 180 plants are believed to emit more than 50 short tons of sulfur dioxide per year in the study area. Also, approximately another 40 to 50 plants were identified, but no data were recorded due to their extremely small size.

It was not possible to obtain data on plant intake for all plants. Some firms, particularly pipeline companies, did not wish to disclose annual volumes. In other cases, the same gas may be processed by more than one facility. Not all "Gas Sweetening Plant Intake" as shown in Table 4 and Appendix 5 is sour. Some sweet gas often by-passes the sweetening unit, but many operators did not have complete data available and reported total gas processed as sweetening plant intake. Thus, the data on the share of gas production that is treated should be used only as a rough approximation.

It is common practice in West Texas for the same gas to be processed several times. One operator of a major plant which processes over 100 billion cubic feet per year, sweetens gas to each individual customer's specifications. Obviously this process greatly complicates calculations of emissions for the operator. Not all gas leaving the plant is of regular pipeline quality. That gas which is not sweetened by the processor is sweetened by the customer down the line either in his own plant or in a contractor's "line straddle" plant. In other instances, gasoline plants operate on sour gas. These gasoline plants sweeten their gasoline product and, at times, their fuel. They sell their still unsweetened residue "gas" to a gas pipeline company who sweetens it.

Because much of the gas in West Texas is only slightly sour, up to about 200 grains of H_2S/100 scf (0.32 mol percent), a great deal of partial processing of gas takes place. In the Smackover area, the gas is generally more sour, and so each plant there does a complete job of sweetening the gas up to pipeline standards.

The variations in hydrogen sulfide content also affect the use of sour gas within gas treating plants and for heating purposes at the lease operations. A total of 30 plants in Texas reporting hydrogen sulfide losses sent some unprocessed gas back to lease operations or vented unprocessed gas. Of these, 28 were in West Texas. Since many West Texas plants are fed by several streams, only one or two of which may be sour, the unprocessed gas can, and often may, be sweet. Further details on the use of unprocessed gas are contained in Item C.6 of this report (p. 89).

Another factor, which does not affect total emissions, is the use of sour gas as boiler and compressor fuel. Some companies always use sweet fuel because of the corrosive effect of sour fuel. Other companies have learned to cope with corrosion and hence use sour fuel for in-plant purposes. Since the point of emission of exhaust gases from these facilities is generally lower than a flare stack, emissions will result in somewhat higher ground level concentrations of sulfur oxides closer to the plant.

3. Sulfur Recovery Plants

In the study area, there are 55 plants that recover sulfur or sulfur products. These plants have an average production of 50 long tons per day of sulfur and recover an average of 85.3 percent of the sulfur in the acid gas feed.

Several factors affect the efficiency of sulfur recovery plants:

- Percent of capacity. Newer plants tend to achieve higher efficiencies because they are operated closer to designed conditions than older plants which serve partially depleted fields.

- Carbon dioxide content of acid gas. The presence of carbon dioxide in the acid gas can have dramatic effects on efficiency, a factor not present in Claus sulfur recovery plants located at refineries. Recovery efficiency varies directly with the percent of hydrogen sulfide in the acid gas stream. For pure or nearly pure hydrogen sulfide streams, efficiencies of three stage new plants are designed to reach in the range of 95 percent, but if the stream is only 5 to 10 percent hydrogen sulfide, recoveries of sulfur may be as low as 10 to 20 percent.

- Number of stages. Some older sulfur recovery plants have only one stage, but most of those in the survey have two stages. New plants with large capacities often have three stages. Practical recovery efficiency of plants processing pure hydrogen sulfide streams rises from about 75 percent with one stage to about 90 percent with two stages and 95 percent with three stages.

- Measurement accuracy. Nearly all gas treating plants have an acid gas meter. The corrosiveness of hydrogen sulfide tends to enlarge the orifice hole, reducing the apparent pressure drop. Another common practice is to analyze acid gas streams by taking a sample in a pressure container back to a laboratory. Hydrogen sulfide tends to react with the container resulting in erroneously low analyses, especially in streams containing less than 0.1 mol percent. Thus, both metering and stream analysis errors tend to understate the amount of acid gas and overstate apparent plant efficiency.

Table 6 summarizes the data on the 55 sulfur recovery plants. These plants:

- process 37 percent of all gas sweetened.
- process 89.9 percent of all sulfur produced from the ground as hydrogen sulfide.
- emit 57 percent of the sulfur dioxide emissions resulting from gas sweetening.

TABLE 6

Plants Recovering Sulfur and Sulfur Products From Natural Gas In Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	No. of Plants	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Sweetened Gas Processed In Plants With Sulfur Recovery	Quantities in Thousand LT/Yr			Average Recovery Efficiency %
					Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted *	
155 (N.M.)	Pecos Permian Basin	5	116	20	61	48	13	78
218 (TX)	Midland-Odessa San Angelo	19	584	32	175	126	49	72
211 (TX)	Amarillo Lubbock	5	252	47	27	22	5	80
217 (TX)	San Antonio	6	71	93	46	34	11	75
215 210 212 214 (TX)	Dallas-Ft. Worth Abilene-Wichita Falls-Austin-Waco-Corpus Christi	3	34	32	75	62	13	82
22 (TX&AR)	Shreveport-Texarkana-Tyler	10	114	88	358	314	44	88
5 (MS, AL FL)	Mobile-Pensacola Panama City Southern Miss.	7	63	88	430	394	36	92
	TOTAL	55	1234	37	1172	1000	172	85.3

*As estimated by Ecology Audits.
Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Appendix 1 contains a list of sulfur recovery plants in the study area.

In at least three cases, the sulfur plant makes sulfuric acid instead of sulfur when it is profitable to do so. Two plants bubble hydrogen sulfide through an ammonia solution. The remaining plants produce elemental sulfur.

Of the 55 plants, only one does not utilize the Claus process. A Stretford unit has been in the start-up stages for over a year to remove hydrogen sulfide from an acid gas stream with a very high carbon dioxide content. To date, the Stretford unit has not yet consistently met even the very low recovery efficiency of the Claus plant it replaced.

Many sulfur recovery plants, particularly smaller units, operate unattended. It would be a major error to compare these plants with Claus plants at refineries because the refinery units rarely have carbon dioxide, which markedly reduces the operating efficiency, and they do have 24 hour on-site availability of chemical engineers, instrumentation specialists and maintenance personnel. Many of the small and medium-sized sulfur plants operate with semi-skilled personnel. Engineers and maintenance personnel often only visit the plants periodically. As a result, Ecology Audits believes that, considering the operating handicaps, the state of the art limits three-stage plant efficiency to about 90 percent on a long-term basis, with reductions for increases in carbon dioxide content in the acid gas.

4. Gas Sweetening Facilities

There were 125 facilities studied in this survey, each of which appeared to emit more than 50 tons of sulfur dioxide annually. It is likely that there may be another 10 or 15 facilities which were not included because, based on preliminary review of reported data, they produced less than the 50 tons per year used as a minimum in the study.

Many of these plants were associated with gasoline plants, but a surprising number, about one-third, are not included in petroleum regulatory agency records. Petroleum regulatory agencies are concerned principally with liquids and if a gas sweetening plant collects no liquids, and many do not, then there is no need to furnish reports. The only way these facilities have been identified is through the survey work of field personnel of the various state air control agencies and the reports furnished by the plant operators.

The gas sweetening plants:

- process 63 percent of all gas sweetened.
- process 10.1 percent of all sulfur produced from the ground.
- emit 43 percent of sulfur dioxide emissions resulting from gas sweetening.

5. Estimates for Balance of United States

The Natural Gas Industry marketed approximately 21,000 billion cubic feet of natural gas in 1973. By using the ratio of production to sales in Texas of 1.1:1, U.S. production is estimated to be about 23,000 billion cubic feet annually.

Table 7 provides details on the estimated natural gas production of other states and the estimates of sulfur dioxide emissions. It shows that the study area includes 87 percent of all sulfur production, 92 percent of recovered sulfur and about 74 percent of the sulfur emissions. Below are comments on the sulfur content of production of the states:

- Alaska - all gas is sweet.
- Arkansas - all production in the northern half of the state is sweet.

TABLE 7

U.S. NATURAL GAS AND SULFUR DATA NOT INCLUDED IN SURVEY

State	Estimated 1973 Natural Gas Production Billions of Cubic Feet	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR Estimated Sulfur Production	Estimated Sulfur Recovered	Estimated Sulfur Emissions
Arkansas (N)	121*	--	--	--
California	504*	6	1	5
Colorado	130*	1*	--	1*
Kansas	900	5	--	5
Kentucky	90	--	--	--
Louisiana (S)	8,000	2*	--	2*
Michigan	44*	5	--	5
Montana	58*	3	--	3
North Dakota	30*	62*	42*	20
New Mexico (NW)	480*	10	--	10
Ohio	50	1	--	1
Oklahoma	1,800	30	3	27
Pennsylvania	70	--	--	--
Utah	50	--	--	--
West Virginia	250	--	--	--
Wyoming	370*	72	47*	25
Other States	75	--	--	--
		197	93	104
95 percent confidence limits		± 35%	± 20%	± 50%

---

*Based on information provided by various state agencies. Other data is estimated based on knowledge of the area.

- California - most California production is sweet, with the exception of some in the Santa Barbara area and offshore.
- Colorado - all production is sweet except for some small fields on the western slope.
- Kansas - some sour gas may exist in the southwestern part of the state.
- Kentucky - no known sour gas production.
- Louisiana - there are fewer than 10 fields that have sour production. All are within 100 miles of New Orleans and flare their acid gas. With this exception, all gas in the state and offshore is sweet.
- Michigan - many of the newer discoveries are sour.
- Montana - some sour production occurs in this state although there are no known sulfur recovery plants.
- New Mexico - there is some sour production in the northwest part of the state.
- North Dakota - some gas in North Dakota is sour and at least one sulfur recovery plant operates in this state.
- Ohio - there is some minor sour gas production.

- Oklahoma - most gas produced in this state will have the same characteristics as that of the Texas Panhandle. One sulfur plant operates in this state.
- Pennsylvania - no known major sources of sour gas.
- Utah - no known major sources of sour gas.
- West Virginia - no known major sources of sour gas.
- Wyoming - a significant portion of Wyoming gas is sour. Four sulfur recovery plants are operated in the state.

All data marked with asteriks (*) in Table 7 were furnished by state agencies and is considered accurate. All other data have been estimated by Ecology Audits and, as indicated in Table 7, are subject to a considerable degree of uncertainty, especially in the estimates of emissions.

6. Fuel Use and Venting of Gas Prior to Processing

The venting and fuel use of gas can take place either within a plant or at other locations in the field.

The data collected by most agencies concentrates on the emissions by plants and large identified facilities. In this report data are compiled on total plant intake, the average sulfur content of gas, sulfur recovery and the balance which is assumed to be flared or vented. From an emissions standpoint, it made no difference whether an operator used sour or sweet gas in his plant process heaters so long as the gas was part of total plant intake.

Some gathering systems do not deliver all of their gas to a plant. The gas not delivered to a plant is often used in field process heaters, or it is vented or flared. For example, if the gathering system develops a leak, the gas in the system will be flared in the field to purge the lines.

The reports for Texas were careful to distinguish whether the venting and fuel use took place after (Section III, lines 4 and 13 of GP-1) or before (Section II, lines 1 and 9 of GP-1) it became part of a plant's intake. No other state compiled this type of data.

Ecology Audits compiled data on 30 gathering systems associated with plants known to process sour gas. It was assumed that the gathering system gas had the same hydrogen sulfide content as the gas entering the plant served by the system. This is a conservative assumption since many gas plants have several feed streams and often only one or two will be sour. The available data does not indicate whether the gas used or vented outside the plant was sweet or sour. All but two of these 30 systems are in West Texas. Table 8 summarizes the data on this venting and field use. The emissions from this are included in Table 4.

In summary, over 99 percent of the emissions of sulfur compounds take place after the gas has entered the plant. Only a minor portion is emitted from produced gas in the field. Furthermore, the venting and fuel use of unprocessed gas generally takes place only in areas where the hydrogen sulfide content of the gas is relatively low.

Table 8

Disposition of Sour Unprocessed Gas From Gathering Systems in Texas

Fuel System and Lease Use	9084 MMCF/year
Vented	561 MMCF/year
Total	9647 MMCF/year*
Sulfur emissions	1233 long tons/year
Average hydrogen sulfide content of unprocessed gas	0.34 percent
Portion of all Texas emissions represented by unprocessed gas	0.60 percent
Portion of Texas field vented and fuel gas to total gas sweetening plant intake	0.29 percent

---

*The numbers are probably under-reported because some lease fuel is used before metering. However, this is negligible.

Appendix 1

LIST OF PLANTS STUDIED

(Texas)

AQCR	COUNTY	FIRM	PLANT NAME	SULFUR RECOVERED
215	Hunt	Quinlan Processing	Quinlan	
	Kaufman	Belco Petroleum	Tawakoni Gas	
	Navarro	Gulf Energy Development Co.	Powell Gas Treating	X
217	Atascosa	Atlantic Richfield Co.	Fashing	X
	"	Elcor Chemical Co.[1]	"	X
	"	Lone Star Gas Co.	"	
	"	Warren Petroleum Co.	"	X
	"	Exxon Company, USA	Jourdonton	X
	Gonzales	HNG Petrochemicals	DuBose	
	Karnes	LoVaca Gathering Co.	Persons	X
	"	Shell Oil Co.	Person	X
22	Camp	Texas Oil & Gas Co.	Gilmer	X
	Cass	Shell Oil Co.	Bryan's Mill	X
	Franklin	Getty Oil Co.	New Hope	X
	"	Texas Oil & Gas Co.	Chitsey	
	Gregg	Cities Service Oil Co.	East Texas	
	Hopkins	Burmah Oil & Gas	Birthright	X
	"	Schneider, Josey & Corey	Nelta	
	"	Warren Petroleum Co.	Como	X
	Upshur	Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co.	Gilmer	
	Van Zandt	Amoco Production Co.	Edgewood	X
	"	Cities Service Oil Co.	Myrtle Springs	X
	Wood	Amoco Production Co.	West Yantis	X
210	Fisher	Continental Oil	Hamlin	
	Scurry	Monsanto Co.	Diamond M	
211	Carson	Shell Oil Co.	Bryan	
	"	Skelly Oil Co.	Crawford	
	"	"	Schafer	

1] Bought acid gas stream from Lone Star Gas Co. Plant has been shut down.

1. LIST OF PLANTS STUDIED

(Texas)

AQCR	COUNTY	FIRM	PLANT NAME	SULFUR RECOVERED
211	Cochran	Cities Service Oil Co.	Lehman	X
	Gray	Skelly Oil Co.	King's Mill	
	Hansford	Phillips Petroleum Co.	Sherman	
	Hockley	Amoco Production Co.	Slaughter	X
	"	" " "	Levelland	
	"	" " "	Anton Irish	
	"	P-C Gas Systems	Levelland	
	Hutchinson	Colorado Interstate	Sanford	
	"	Phillips Petroleum Co.	Candiam	
	"	Texas Sulfur Products [2]	"	X
	"	Skelly Oil Co.	Watkins	
	Moore	Colorado Interstate	Bivins	
	"	Diamond-Shamrock	McKee	X
	"	Phillips Petroleum Co.	Sneed	
	"	" " "	Dumas	
	"	Texas Sulfur Products [2]	Dumas	X
	"	Panhandle Eastern	Cabot Booster	
	Wheeler	Natural Gas Pipeline	Plant #163 (Briscoe)	
	Yoakum	Amoco Production Co.	Prentice	
	"	Shell Oil Co.	Wasson	
212	Freestone	Getty Oil Co.	Teas	X
	Limestone	Lone Star Production Co.	Box Church	
214	Bee	Coastal States Gas Co.	Pawnee	
	McMullen	Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Co.	Tilden	X
	Kenedy	Exxon Company, USA	Sarita	
218	Andrews	Amoco Production Co.	Midland Farms	X
	"	" " "	South Fullerton	X
	"	El Paso Natural Gas Co.	Fullerton	
	"	Phillips Petroleum Co.	Fullerton	
	"	" " "	Andrews	X
	"	Union Oil Co.	Bakke	
	"	" " "	Dollarhide	
	"	Texaco, Inc.	Mabee	

---

[2] Buys acid gas from nearby Phillips plants.

1. LIST OF PLANTS STUDIED

(Texas)

AQCR	COUNTY	FIRM	PLANT NAME	SULFUR RECOVERED
218	Crane	El Paso Natural Gas	McElroy	
	"	Mobil Oil Corp.	Sand Hills	
	"	Phillips Petroleum Co.	Crane	X
	"	Warren Petroleum Co.	Waddell	X
	"	" " "	Sand Hills	X
	"	Atlantic Richfield Co.	Block 31	
	"	Exxon Company, USA	Sand Hills	X
	Crockett	El Paso Natural Gas co.	Midway Line	
	"	Ozona Gas Processing	Ozona	
	"	Permian Corp.	Todd	
	"	Perry Gas Processors	N. Tippett	
	"	Texas Oil & Gas Co.	MPI	
	Dawson	Cities Service Oil Co.	Welch	X
	Ector	Amarillo Oil Co.	Andector	X
	"	Amoco Production Co.	N. Cowden	X
	"	El Paso Natural Gas Co.	Goldsmith	
	"	Getty Oil Co.	Headlee	
	"	Phillips Petroleum Co.	Goldsmith	X
	"	Shell Oil Co.	TXL	
	"	Odessa Natural Gasoline	Texas	X
	Gaines	Amoco Production Co.	Cedar Lake	
	"	Phillips Petroleum Co.	Seminole	
	"	Cities Service Oil Co.	West Seminole	
	"	" " " "	Sulfur Plant No. 67	X
	Howard	Skelly Oil Co.	East Vealmoor	
	Irion	CRA, Inc.	Mertzon	
	Midland	Mobil Oil Co.	Pegasus	
	Pecos	El Paso Natural Gas Co.	Santa Rosa	
	"	Hassie Hunt Trust	N. Puckett	
	"	Intratex Gas. Co.	W. Gomez	
	"	Mobil Oil Co.	Waha	
	"	" " "	Coyanasa	X
	"	Northern Natural Gas. Co.	Pikes Peak	
	"	" " " "	Jasper	
	"	Texas Oil & Gas	Coyanasa	
	"	LoVaca Gathering Co.	Gomez	

1. LIST OF PLANTS STUDIED

(Texas)

AQCR	COUNTY	FIRM	PLANT NAME	SULFUR RECOVERED
218	Pecos	LoVaca Gathering Co.	W. Gomez	
	"	" " "	Petco	
	"	Marathon Oil Co.	Yates	X
	"	Transwestern Pipeline Co.	Chenot-Putnam	
	"	Atlantic Richfield Co.	Imperial	
	Reagan	Dorchester Gas Co.	Texon	X
	"	Pecos Co.	Barnhart	X
	Reeves	Pioneer Natural Gas Co.	Barstow	
	"	El Paso Natural Gas Co.	Waha	
	"	LoVaca Gathering Co.	Greasewood	
	"	Texaco, Inc.	Knight	
	Schleicher	Atlantic Richfield Co.	El Dorado	
	Tom Green	Beacon Gasoline	H. J. Strawn	
	" "	Marathon Oil	Suzan Peak	
	Upton	El Paso Natural Gas Co.	Wilshire	
	"	Atlantic Richfield Co.	Crane	
	Ward	Cabot Corp.	Estes	
	"	Intratex Gas	MiVida	X
	"	Natural Gas Pipeline	Plant #160 (Pyote)	
	"	Northern Natural Gas Co.	Lockridge	
	"	Perry Gas Processors	Pyote	
	"	Warren Petroleum Co.	Monohans	
	"	LoVaca Gathering Co.	MiVida	
	"	" " "	Pyote	
	"	" " "	Block 21	
	"	Transwestern Pipeline Co.	Pyote	
	"	" " "	Estes	
	Winkler	Amoco Production Co.	Monohans	
	"	Perry R. Bass	Halley	
	"	Cabot Corp.	Walton	
	"	Northern Natural Gas	Kermit	
	"	Transwestern Pipeline Co.	Halley	
	"	" " "	Walton	
	"	" " "	Plant #164 (Kermit)	
	"	" " "	Keystone	
	"	Natural Gas Pipeline	Kermit	
	"	Texaco, Inc.	South Kermit	

1. LIST OF PLANTS STUDIED

(New Mexico)

AQCR	COUNTY	FIRM	PLANT NAME	SULFUR RECOVERED
155	Eddy	Amoco Production	Empire Abo	X
	"	Yates Gasoline (operated by Transwestern)	Artesia	
	"	Southern Union Gas	Indian Hills	
	"	Marathon Oil Co.	Indian Basin	X
	"	Phillips Petroleum Co.	Artesia	X
	"	" " "	Lusk	
	Lea	Climax Chemical	Hobbs	X
	"	Continental Oil	Maljamar	
	"	El Paso Natural Gas	Monument 3]	
	"	" " "	Jal No.1	
	"	" " "	Jal No.3	
	"	" " "	Jal No. 4	
	"	" " "	Eunice 4]	
	"	Northern Natural Gas	Hobbs	
	"	Perry Gas Processors	Antelope Ridge	
	"	Tipperary-Resources	Denton-Lovington	
	"	Warren Petroleum Co.	Monument 3]	
	"	" " "	Saunders	
	"	" " "	Eunice	
	"	" " "	Tatum	
	"	Texaco, Inc.	Buckeye	
	"	Skelly Oil Co.	Eunice No. 1	
	"	" " "	Eunice No. 2	
	"	Phillips Petroleum Co.	Wilson 4]	
	"	" " "	Lovington	
	"	" " "	Eunice 4]	
	"	" " "	Hobbs	
	"	" " "	Buckeye	
	"	Transwestern Pipeline Co.	Belle Lake	
	Roosevelt	Cities Service Oil Co.	Bluitt	X

3] Acid gas from these plants is sold to Climax Chemical, Hobbs.

4] Wilson and Eunice plants of Phillips are adjacent. Eunice acid gas stream goes to El Paso Eunice plant.

1. LIST OF PLANTS STUDIED

(Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida)

AQCR	COUNTY	FIRM	PLANT NAME	SULFUR RECOVERED
22 Arkansas	Columbia	Arkansas-Louisiana Gas	Hamilton	X
	Lafayette	Phillips Petroleum Co.	McCamey	X
5 Mississippi	Clarke	Shell Oil Co.	Goodwater	X
	"	Tonkawa Gas Co.	Harmony	
	"	Continental Oil Co.	Pachuta Creek & West Nancy	
	"	Getty Oil Co.	Pachuta Creek Area	
	"	Amerada-Hess	Eucutta Station	
	Smith	Shell Oil Co.	Tallahala Creek	
	Rankin	" " "	Thomasville	X
	Wayne	Amerada-Hess	Quitmon & Cypress Creek	
	"	Mobil Oil	S. Cypress Creek	
5 Alabama	Escambia	Exxon Co. USA	Flomaton	X
5 Florida	Escambia	Louisiana Land & Exploration Co.	Wiggins Lake	X
	"	Exxon Co. USA	Jay	X
	"	Amerada-Hess (Mississippi-Florida)	Jay	X
	"	Sun Oil Co.	Jay	X

Appendix 2

PRODUCTION OF SULFUR BY COUNTIES

STATE	50,000 or more LT/YR	5,000 to 50,000 LT/YR	500 to 5,000 LT/YR	less than 500 LT/YR
New Mexico	Lea	Eddy		
		Roosevelt		
Alabama		Escambia		
Florida	Escambia			
Mississippi	Rankin	Clarke	Wayne	Smith
Arkansas		Lafayette	Columbia	
Texas	Cass	Franklin	Crockett	Gregg
	Van Zandt	Hopkins	Dawson	Upshur
	Crane	Wood	Reagan	Howard
	Ector	Andrews	Gonzales	Midland
		Gaines	Carson	Schleicher
		Pecos	Cochran	Irion
		Reeves	Hutchinson	Tom Green
		Ward	Wheeler	Upton
		Winkler	Hunt	Hansford
		Atascosa	Navarro	Bee
		Karnes		Limestone
		Hockley		Fisher
		Moore		Scurry
		Yoakum		Kaufman
		McMullen		Gray
		Freestone		


PERMIAN
BASIN
SMACKOVER — FORMATION

AREAS STUDIED FOR
SULFUR EMISSIONS
EPA CONTRACT Nº 68-02-1308
TASK Nº 26

PRODUCTION OF SULFUR BY COUNTY IN ALABAMA


TENNESSEE RIVER VALLEY (ALABAMA)
CUMBERLAND MOUNTAINS (TENNESSEE)
INTERSTATE
EAST
ALABAMA
INTRASTATE
METROPOLITAN
BIRMINGHAM
INTRASTATE
COLUMBUS (GEORGIA)
PHENIX CITY (ALABAMA)
INTERSTATE
ALABAMA
AND
TOMBIGBEE
RIVERS
INTRASTATE
SOUTHEAST
ALABAMA
INTRASTATE
AQCR 5
MOBILE (ALABAMA) - PENSACOLA - PANAMA CITY
(FLORIDA) - SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI INTERSTATE
LAUDERDALE
LIMESTONE
MADISON
JACKSON
COLBERT
DE KALB
CHEROKEE
ETOWAH
CLEBURNE
TALLADEGA
CLAY
COOSA
LEE
RUSSELL
BULLOCK
BALDWIN
▦ 5,000 to 50,000 LT/YR

PRODUCTION OF SULFUR BY COUNTY IN ARKANSAS


METROPOLITAN FORT SMITH INTERSTATE (ARKANSAS-OKLAHOMA)
NORTHWEST ARKANSAS INTRASTATE
NORTHEAST ARKANSAS INTRASTATE
METROPOLITAN MEMPHIS INTERSTATE (ARKANSAS-MISSISSIPPI-TENNESSEE)
AQCR 22
SHREVEPORT-TEXARKANA-TYLER INTERSTATE (ARKANSAS LOUISIANNA-OKLAHOMA-TEXAS)
CENTRAL ARKANSAS INTRASTATE
MONROE-EL DORADO INTERSTATE (ARKANSAS-LOUISIANNA)
500 to 5,000 LT/YR
5,000 to 50,000 LT/YR

PRODUCTION OF SULFUR BY COUNTY IN FLORIDA


JACKSONVILLE-BRUNSWICK INTERSTATE (FLORIDA-GEORGIA)
MOBILE-PENSACOLA-PANAMA CITY-SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI INTERSTATE (ALABAMA-FLORIDA)
AQCR 5
CENTRAL FLORIDA INTRASTATE
WEST CENTRAL FLORIDA INTRASTATE
SOUTHWEST FLORIDA INTRASTATE
SOUTHEAST FLORIDA INTRASTATE
▨ 50,000 or more LT/YR

PRODUCTION OF SULFUR BY COUNTY IN MISSISSIPPI


METROPOLITAN MEMPHIS INTERSTATE (ARKANSAS-MISSISSIPPI-TENNESSEE)
NORTHEAST MISSISSIPPI INTRASTATE
MISSISSIPPI DELTA INTRASTATE
AQCR 5
MOBILE-PENSACOLA-PANAMA CITY-SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI INTERSTATE (ALABAMA-FLORIDA-MISSISSIPPI)
Less than 500 LT/YR
500 to 5,000 LT/YR
5,000 to 50,000 LT/YR
50,000 or more LT/YR

PRODUCTION OF SULFUR BY COUNTY IN NEW MEXICO


ALBUQUERQUE-MID RIO GRANDE INTRASTATE
FOUR CORNERS INTERSTATE (ARIZONA-COLORADO-NEW MEXICO-UTAH)
UPPER RIO GRANDE VALLEY INTRASTATE
NORTHEASTERN PLAINS INTRASTATE
SOUTHWESTERN MOUNTAINS-AUGUSTINE PLAINS INTRASTATE
AQCR 155
PECOS-PERMIAN BASIN INTRASTATE
ARIZONA-NEW MEXICO SOUTHERN BORDER INTERSTATE
EL PASO-LAS CRUCES-ALAMOGORDO INTERSTATE (NEW MEXICO-TEXAS)
SAN JUAN
RIO ARRIBA
COLFAX
UNION
MORA
HARDING
LOS ALAMOS
MC KINLEY
SANDOVAL
SANTA FE
SAN MIGUEL
QUAY
BERNALILLO
VALENCIA
GUADALUPE
TORRANCE
CURRY
DE BACA
CATRON
SOCORRO
LINCOLN
CHAVES
SIERRA
GRANT
OTERO
DONA ANA
LUNA
HIDALGO

▦ 5,000 to 50,000 LT/YR

▨ 50,000 or more LT/YR

PRODUCTION OF SULFUR BY COUNTY IN TEXAS


AQCR 211
AMARILLO-LUBBOCK INTRASTATE
AQCR 210
ABILENE-WICHITA FALLS INTRASTATE
AQCR 215
METROPOLITAN DALLAS-FORT WORTH INTRASTATE
SHREVEPORT-TEXARKANA-TYLER INTERSTATE (ARKANSAS-LOUISIANA-OKLAHOMA-TEXAS)
AQCR 22
AQCR 218
MIDLAND-ODESSA-SAN ANGELO INTRASTATE
SOUTHERN LOUISIANA-SOUTHEAST TEXAS INTERSTATE
EL PASO-LAS CRUCES-ALAMOGORDO INTERSTATE (TEXAS-NEW MEXICO)
AQCR 212
AUSTIN-WACO INTRASTATE
AQCR 216
METROPOLITAN HOUSTON-GALVESTON INTRASTATE
METROPOLITAN SAN ANTONIO INTRASTATE
AQCR 217
AQCR 214
CORPUS-CHRISTI-VICTORIA INTRASTATE
BROWNSVILLE-LAREDO INTRASTATE
AQCR 213
Less than 500 LT/YR
500 to 5,000 LT/YR
5,000 to 50,000 LT/YR
50,000 or more LT/YR

Appendix 3

REPORT FORMS USED BY SEVERAL STATE PETROLEUM REGULATORY AGENCIES

Form A-10
Sheet 1

ALABAMA OIL AND GAS BOARD

GASOLINE OR OTHER EXTRACTION PLANT MONTHLY REPORT

Report of .... for the month of ...., 19.........

Address ....
(Main Office) (Plant)

Report all Volumes in M. C. F. at 14.4 lbs. plus 4 oz. pressure

INTAKE VOLUME		M. C. F.
Total Gas From Oil Wells	(Detail on Sheet 2)	
Total Gas From Gas Wells	(Detail on Sheet 2)	
Total Gas from Other Sources	(Detail on Sheet 2)	
TOTAL		

DISPOSITION OF RESIDUE	M. C. F.
Plant Fuel	
Returned for Lease Fuel	
Sold or Other Disposition (Detail Below)	
Returned to Earth	
[illegible]	
Shrinkage	
TOTAL	

Detail of Sale or Other Disposition of Residue

NAME OF PURCHASER OR USER	ADDRESS	USED FOR	M. C. F.
TOTAL			

Plant Production, Receipts, Deliveries and Stock, in Barrels of 42 U. S. Gallons

PRODUCE	OPENING STOCK	RECEIPTS	PRODUCTION	DELIVERIES	CLOSING STOCK
Crude Oil					
Condensate					
Gasoline					
Butane					
Propane					
Kerosene					
Other					
TOTAL					

Remarks ....

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF.................................... }
COUNTY OF.................................... }

Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared .... known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to this report, who after being by me duly sworn on oath or affirmation states that he is authorized to make and execute this report, that this report, including Sheet 2, is a true and correct reflection of the record of the operations reported herein, and that no pertinent matter inquired about in this report has been omitted therefrom.

....
Name of Operator

Sworn to and subscribed before me this

day of .... 19.........

(Signature) .... (Title)

....
Notary Public in and for ....

(Follow instructions on reverse side)

Reproduced from
best available copy.

INSTRUCTIONS

The addresses, as required on this report, shall be clear and definite as to street number, city and state.

A report on this form, including sheet 2, shall be made by each operator of a gasoline plant, cycling plant, or any other plant, at which gasoline, butane, propane, condensate, kerosene, oil or other liquid products are extracted from natural gas.

This report shall be filed on or before the 25th day of each calendar month and shall be complete as to data covering the calendar month next preceding the date of filing. An executed copy shall be filed with the Alabama Oil and Gas Board.

NOTE: "Deliveries"—show under "REMARKS" the name of the Transporter and the quantity delivered to each, except deliveries to trucks may be reported in Total only.

On Sheet 2 of this form, group and report by lease the volumes of "Gas from Oil Wells," and the total thereof; group and report by well the volume of "Gas from Gas Wells" and the total thereof; report by each source the volume of "Gas From Other Sources" and the Total thereof; and report the Total Intake Volume from All Sources.

Make a separate report for each plant.

If any space does not apply, fill in the word "none".

Please use the typewriter if possible.

Form A-18
Sheet 2

ALABAMA OIL AND GAS BOARD

GASOLINE OR OTHER EXTRACTION PLANT MONTHLY REPORT

Report of.. for the month of..............................

Report all Volumes in M. C. F. at 14.4 lbs. plus 4 oz. pressure

Detail of Intake Volume

NAME OF PRODUCER	Lease Name	Location			County	Kind of Well	Well No.	Allowable M. C. F.	Take M. C. F.
		S.	T.	R.					
TOTAL									

AOGC-7-(64)

Arkansas Oil and Gas Commission

EL DORADO, ARKANSAS

MONTHLY GAS REPORT

Field County

Report of (Name of Initial Taker) For the Month of , 19

Address (Main Office) (Local or Field Office)

Report All Volumes in M. C. F. at 14.4 Lbs. Plus 4 Oz. Pressure

ACQUISITION

Name of Producer	Lease Name	Well No.	Allowable M. C. F.	Production M. C. F.	Over/Under M. C. F.	Accumulated Over/Under M. C. F.
TOTAL						

DISPOSITION

Used For	Name of Company	Address	Volume
Fuel System			
Lease Use			
Transmission System			
Other Disposition (Detail)			
TOTAL			

Remarks:

(If space herewith is inadequate—please write letter and attach hereto)

CERTIFICATE

I declare under the penalties of perjury that this report has been examined by me and to the best of my knowledge is true, correct and complete.

INSTRUCTIONS

The addresses, as required on this report, shall be clear and definite as to street number, city and state.

Report on this form all gas taken into a fuel system, transmission system, or any other system, except gas taken into a gasoline, cycling, or other extraction plant gathering system which is required to be reported on Gasoline or Other Extraction Plant Monthly Report, Form AOGC 8-(56). In case the gas from any well is taken by any person other than the producer, then such person taking the gas shall make and file said report. Where such gas is taken from an oil or gas well by the producer, then the producer shall make and file said report.

This report shall be filed on or before the 15th day of each calendar month and shall be complete as to data covering the calendar month next preceding the date of filing. An executed copy shall be filed with the Arkansas Oil and Gas Commission, El Dorado, Arkansas.

Report the volume of gas taken from each gas well separately. Report the volume of gas taken from oil wells by leases. All volumes shall be reported in M. C. F. at 14.4 Lbs. plus 4 Oz. pressure.

AOGC—8—(56)
Sheet 1

ARKANSAS OIL AND GAS COMMISSION

EL DORADO, ARKANSAS

Gasoline or Other Extraction Plant Monthly Report

Report of ______________________ For the Month of ______________________, 19____

Address ______________________

______________________ (Main Office) ______________________ (Plant)

Report All Volumes in M. C. F. at 14.4 Lbs. Plus 4 Oz. Pressure

Intake Volume

		M. C. F.
TOTAL GAS FROM OIL WELLS	(Detail on Sheet 2)	
TOTAL GAS FROM GAS WELLS	(Detail on Sheet 2)	
TOTAL GAS FROM OTHER SOURCES	(Detail on Sheet 2)	
TOTAL		

Disposition of Residue

	M. C. F.
PLANT FUEL	
RETURNED FOR LEASE FUEL	
SOLD OR OTHER DISPOSITION (Detail Below)	
RETURNED TO EARTH	
VENTED	
SHRINKAGE	
TOTAL	

Detail of Sale or Other Disposition of Residue

Name of Purchaser or User	Address	Used For	M. C. F.
TOTAL			

Plant Production, Receipts, Deliveries and Stock, in Barrels of 42 U. S. Gallons

Product	Opening Stock	Receipts	Production	Deliveries	Closing Stock
CRUDE OIL					
CONDENSATE					
GASOLINE					
BUTANE					
PROPANE					
KEROSENE					
OTHER					
TOTAL					

Remarks: ______________________

CERTIFICATE

I declare under the penalties of perjury that this report has been examined by me and to the best of my knowledge is true, correct and complete.

____

INSTRUCTIONS

The addresses, as required on this report, shall be clear and definite as to street number, city and state.

A report on this form, including Sheet 2, shall be made by each operator of a Gasoline Plant, Cycling Plant, or any other Plant, at which Gasoline, Butane, Propane, Condensate, Kerosene, Oil or Other Liquid Products are extracted from Natural Gas.

This report shall be filed on or before the 15th day of each calendar month and shall be complete as to data covering the calendar month next preceding the date of filing. An executed copy shall be filed with the Arkansas Oil and Gas Commission.

NOTE: "DELIVERIES"—show under "REMARKS" the name of the Transporter and the quantity delivered to each, except deliveries to trucks may be reported in Total only.

On Sheet 2 of this form, group and report by lease the volumes of "Gas From Oil Wells," and the total thereof; group and report by well the volume of "Gas From Gas Wells" and the total thereof; report by each source the volume of "Gas From Other Sources" and the total thereof; and report the Total Intake Volume From All Sources.

Make a separate report for each plant.

If any space does not apply, fill in the word "NONE."

Please use typewriter if possible.

Department of Natural Resources
State of Florida

Form 8

Monthly Producer's Natural Gas Report

Field ______________________

Report of ______________________ (Name of Producer)

Month of ______________________ , 19__

______________________ (Address of Main Office)

______________________ (Address of Local or Field Office)

Report all Volumes in M. C. F. at 14.4 lbs plus 4 oz Pressure and 60°F.

Production

Zone--Lease Name	Well No.	County	Location		Allowable M. C. F.	Production M. C. F.
			Survey	Section		
Grand Total						

Dispositions

Utilization	M. C. F.
Producer's Field Operations	
Reserved by Lessors	
Vented to Atmosphere from Gas Wells	
Vented to Atmosphere from Oil Wells	
Others (denote)	
Sales or Deliveries Name of Company Address	
Total	

Affidavit

State of Florida

County of ______________________

GASOLINE PLANT OR PRESSURE MAINTENANCE PLANT MONTHLY REPORT

Operator			**Address**		
Plant Name		**Field**		**County**	
Month of	**Type of plant**	**Av. intake capacity** MCF	**Av. intake pressure** PSIA	**Av. tested gpm**	**Recovered gpm**

SECTION I—INTAKE VOLUMES (MCF MONTHLY)

	Gas wells	Casinghead	Total
1. No. of wells produced			
2. Gas into gathering system			
3. Deliveries from gathering system. (Total of section II)			
4. Gathering system to plant for processing			
5. Plant intake—from plant meters			
6. Loss or gain—Diff between lines 4 & 5			
7. Gas from other sources (Detail in Remarks)			
8. Refinery and storage vapors			
9. Total gas to plant for processing			

SECTION II—DISPOSITION OF UNPROCESSED GAS FROM GATHERING SYSTEM (MCF MONTHLY)

	Gas wells	Casinghead	Total
1. Fuel system & lease use			
2. Gas lift			
3. Repressuring & pressure maintenance			
4. Transmission line			
5. Vented			
6. Other processing plants or carbon black plants			
7. Total			

SECTION III—DISPOSITION OF RESIDUE GAS (MCF MONTHLY)

1. Extraction loss	2. Acid gas	3. Plant fuel	4. Lease fuel	5. Gas lift	6. Repressuring & press. maint.
7. Carbon black pl.	8. Other proc. pl.	9. Transmiss. line	10. Vented	11. Total	

SECTION IV—PLANT PRODUCTION, RECEIPTS, DELIVERIES, FLARE AND STOCK IN 42-GAL. BBLS.

Product	Open'g stock	Receipts	Production	Deliveries	Flare	Clos'g stock
Crude Oil						
Condensate						
Gasoline						
Kerosene						
Butane						
Propane						
[illegible] Loss						
Total						

Continued on Reverse Side

MISSISSIPPI STATE OIL AND GAS BOARD

Gasoline Plant or Pressure Maintenance Report

FORM 11 - IOCC G-9

Authorized by Order No. 118-58 **Effective November 1, 1958**

Company	Use	Processed	Unprocessed

1. Reason for venting unprocessed gas

2. Reason for venting residue gas

3.

SECTION VI—DETAIL OF MONTHLY GAS INTAKE (USE FORM ENTITLED "DETAIL OF INTAKE VOLUME" WHEN NECESSARY)

Well owner	Name of lease	Kind of gas	Well number	Take M. C. F.

NOTE: All volumes must be corrected to a pressure of__________psia and to a temperature of ____________________°F.

Executed this the________day of____________________, 19____

State of____________________}

County of____________________}

____
Signature of Affiant

Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared______________________________known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the above instrument, who being by me dully sworn on oath states, that he is duly authorized to make the above report and that he has knowledge of the facts stated therein, and that said report is true and correct.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this________day of____________________, 19____

SEAL

____

My commission expires____________________

Notary Public in and for____________________

County,____________________

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
BOX [illegible] SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

OPERATOR'S MONTHLY REPORT

[illegible]
[illegible] ORIGINAL TO OCC SANTA FE
ONE COPY TO OCC DIST. OFFICE
ONE COPY TO TRANSPORTER

(Company or Operator) ____________ (Address) ____________ FOR MONTH ____________ Page ______ of ____

POOL NAME (Underline) *LEASE NAME WELL NO. UNIT SEC. TWP. RNG.	WELL STATUS	TOTAL LIQUIDS PRODUCED			GAS PRODUCED MCF	DAYS PROD.	DISPOSITION OF GAS						DISPOSITION OF OIL					
		MONTHLY OIL ALLOWABLE	ACTUAL BARRELS PRODUCED	BARRELS OF WATER PRODUCED			VENTED	USED ON LEASE	SOLD	PURCH.	OTHER	CODE	OIL ON HAND BEG. OF MONTH	BARRELS TO TRANSPORTER	OTHER	CODE	TRANSPORTER	OIL ON HAND END OF MONTH
*LEASE NAME – Include State Land Lease Number or Federal Lease Number																		

STATUS CODE
F ..... FLOWING
P ..... PUMPING
G ..... GAS LIFT
S ..... SHUT IN
T ..... TEMP. ABANDONED
I ..... INJECTION

"OTHER" GAS DISPOSITION CODE
X ..... USED OFF LEASE } (DESTINATION MUST BE SHOWN ON FORM C-111)
D ..... USED FOR DRILLING }
G ..... GAS LIFT
L ..... LOST (MCF ESTIMATED)
E ..... EXPLANATION ATTACHED
R ..... REPRESSURING OR PRESSURE MAINTENANCE

"OTHER" OIL DISPOSITION CODE
C ..... CIRCULATING OIL
L ..... LOST
S ..... SEDIMENTATION (BS&W)
E ..... EXPLANATION ATTACHED

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION GIVEN IS TRUE AND COMPLETE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE.

(SIGNATURE) (DATE)

(POSITION)

Form C-111 Sheet No. 1
Supersedes old Form C-111 & C-114
Effective 1-1-65

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
GAS PURCHASERS MONTHLY REPORT

Operator and Address	Plant	Month

REPORT ALL VOLUMES OF GAS IN MCF AT 15.025 PSIA AND 60°F

SECTION I – Volume of Gas Taken	VOLUME – MCF
Total Gas From Oil Wells (Detail on Sheet 2)	
Total Gas From Gas Wells (Detail on Sheet 2)	
Total Gas From Other Sources (Detail on Sheet 2)	
TOTAL TAKES	

Gasoline or Other Extraction Plant Only:

Deduct Volume That By-Passed Plant and Was Not Processed	
TOTAL PLANT INPUT	

SECTION II – Disposition		ITEM	UNPROCESSED GAS VOLUME MCF	ITEM	PLANT RESIDUE VOLUME MCF
Lease Use	Detail Below	a.		h.	
Gas Drilling Operation	" "	b.		i.	
Gas Lift	" "	c.		j.	
Fuel System	" "	d.		k.	
Returned to Lease For Fuel	" "	e.		l.	
Returned to Earth	" "	f.		m.	
Sold or Other Disposition	" "	g.		n.	
Plant Fuel					
Vented					
Shrinkage					
Totals					
GRAND TOTAL – ALL DISPOSITION					

SECTION III – Detail of Disposition *(Show each individual disposition of items above.)* *(Attach additional sheets if necessary)*

ITEM	NAME AND ADDRESS OF PURCHASER OR USER	USED FOR	VOLUME – MCF

SECTION IV – Plant Production, Receipts, Deliveries, and Stock in Barrels of 42 U.S. Gallons.

PRODUCT	OPENING STOCK	RECEIPTS	PRODUCTION	DELIVERIES	CLOSING STOCK
Oil					
Condensate					
Gasoline					
Butane					
Propane					
Kerosene					
Other					
TOTAL					

Remarks: ______________________________

____

____

Signature ______________________________ Title ______________ Date ______________

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS

OIL AND GAS DIVISION

COMMISSIONERS
BEN RAMSEY
Chairman
BYRON TUNNELL
JIM C. LANGDON
[illegible] OSBORNE, Secretary

ARTHUR H. BARBECK
Chief Engineer

AUSTIN, TEXAS

MEMORANDUM TO: All Plant Operators

SUBJECT: Reporting Facilities on Form GP-1, Monthly Report for Gas Processing Plants

Form GP-1, revised October, 1968, is now available at all District Offices. This form is required to be used by plant operators in filing reports for January, 1969, which are due in the District Office on or before February 25, 1969.

Please note that the new Form GP-1 is designed to facilitate the reporting of a whole plant system (including drips, scrubbers, compressors, etc.) on one report at the option of the operator. Attached are instructions and examples concerning the filing of revised Form GP-1. If further information is needed, please contact the Railroad Commission of Texas, Oil & Gas Division, Production and Proration Section, P. O. Drawer EE, Austin, Texas, 78711.

James C. Bouldin

James C. Bouldin, Director
of Production and Proration

FORM GP-1

MONTHLY REPORT FOR GAS PROCESSING PLANTS AND/OR OTHER FACILITIES REPORTED ON GP-1

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

This report shall be filed in four (4) duplicate originals with the District Director of the Railroad Commission of Texas for the District in which the plant is located as soon after the first of the month as possible for the preceding month, and never later than the twenty-fifth of the month.

Form GP-1 is required for all plants processing natural gas. Processing includes recovering liquid hydrocarbons and/or treating gas for H_2S and CO_2. All gas volumes must be reported at a Base Pressure of 14.65 pounds per square inch absolute and a Base Temperature of 60 degrees Fahrenheit. All liquid quantities shown on this report shall be in barrels of 42 U. S. Gallons based on actual physical gauges computed from 100% U. S. Tank Tables or other method of measurement approved by the Commission and corrected from the temperature at the time of measurement to a standard temperature of 60 degrees Fahrenheit.

Do not use fractions of thousands of cubic feet of gas or fractions of barrels of liquid on this report.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

In accordance with Statewide Rule 61, no gasoline plant shall be operated without a Certificate of Compliance approved by the Commission which shall be in effect for a twelve-month period, and is to be renewed each year.

In accordance with Statewide Rule 62, no cycling plant shall be operated without a Certificate of Compliance. Application for Certificate of Compliance shall be filed each year for renewal, August 1. After "Statement of Inspection" on Application has been approved at the District Office, a Certificate of Compliance for Cycling will be issued from the Austin Office.

A Certificate of Compliance for Cycling (where gas is injected into a reservoir for credit to gas wells) is sufficient compliance for all products that may be recovered at the plant.

The Certificate of Compliance for Gasoline Plants and Application for Certificate of Compliance for Cycling Plants, are to be filed in triplicate with the District Director of The Railroad Commission in which District the plant is located.

No Certificate of Compliance is required for other type plants (Drips, Scrubbers, Separators, Dehydrators, etc.) when only condensate or unprocessed liquid hydrocarbons are recovered.

SEMI-ANNUAL CASINGHEAD GAS CONNECTIONS

A semi-annual list of casinghead gas connections is required from all plant operators that gather casinghead gas from oil wells. These lists are to be filed in duplicate with the District Director of the Commission District in which the plant is located on or before January 15, and July 15, of each year and are to show the connections as of January 1, and July 1, respectively. The list should be arranged by field, operator, lease, RRC lease number, and each well number.

FORM GP-1 INSTRUCTIONS

HEADING

District Number - Railroad Commission District in which the plant is located.

Serial Number - Assigned by District Director of District in which the plant is located.

Plant Name - Name of plant being reported. Several Facilities (Drips, Scrubbers, Compressors, Central Separation Facilities, etc.) may be reported on one Form GP-1 if the plants serve a main system where gas is delivered for final processing and disposition. (See attached examples.)

System Name - Name of system that plant serves, if any.

Fields - Source of Gas Supply

County - Location of Plant

Daily Average Intake Capacity of Plant - The maximum Daily MCF that plant was constructed to process.

SECTION I: INTAKE VOLUMES

When filing a system report, this and all appropriate sections should include, the wells and volumes from all wells connected to the whole system.

1. Number of Wells Produced:

Gas Wells - Total number of sweet, sour, non-associated and/or associated gas wells produced.

Oil Wells - For the purpose of this report, a producing oil well is one that is producing or has an assigned allowable which may be transferred and produced by another well or wells for injection or efficiency purposes.

2. Gas Into Gathering System:

Initial reporting of gas production from wells connected to plant for processing regardless of the ownership and/or operation of the gathering system. The volumes shown as "Gas Into the Gathering System" should be the volumes measured at the well for gas well gas and on the lease for casinghead gas, or these well and/or lease volumes adjusted by a central point delivery meter volume.

Do not include any gas volume into the gathering system that has been previously reported on Form GP-1 for another facility. Gas received from other facilities is correctly reported on Line 8 as "Gas From Other Processing Plants."

3. **Deliveries From Gathering System:**

   Any delivery or use of gas that is not processed for recovery of liquid hydrocarbons.

4. **Gathering System to Plant for Processing:**

   Difference between lines 2 and 3.

5. **Plant Intake - From Plant Meters:**

   Plant intake meter volumes of gas produced by wells connected to gathering system and reported in lines above. Gas volumes reported on Lines 7 through 11 should not be included. Complete Line 5 whether a Loss or Gain from plant is shown.

6. **Loss or Gain:**

   Difference between Lines 4 and 5

7. **Refinery and Storage Vapors:**

8. **Gas from Other Processing Plants:**

   Gas that is received for further processing from another processing plant or facility being reported on Form GP-1. Show name of plant that gas is received from on this line and the amount of gas in Total Column.

9. **Gas From Main Transmission Line:**

10. **Gas Withdrawn From Storage:**

11. **Gas Imported From Other States:**

    Report all gas imported from other States that is received into plant for processing or further disposition. Show name of State on this line and the amount of gas in the Total Column.

12. **Net Gas to Plant for Processing:**

    Total of Lines 5 and Lines 7 through 11.

SECTION II: DISPOSITION O: UNPROCESSED GAS FROM GATHERING SYSTEM

Total disposition must balance and total must agree with volume reported on Line 3, Section I.

Definition of dispositions applicable to this section shown in Section III.

SECTION III: DISPOSITION OF RESIDUE GAS

Extraction Loss

Loss in volume due to removal of liquid hydrocarbons. The volumetric equivalent must be reported for liquids recovered from any

type facility when gas volumes are reported. Do not include any H_2S or CO_2 losses in this disposition. Use lines 2 and/or 3.

Lease Fuel and Use

Gas used, sold, or given for field operations, lease drilling fuel, compressor fuel, etc.

Gas Lift

Gas used, sold, or given for injection into oil wells to lift oil.

Repressuring & Pressure Maintenance

Gas used, sold, or given to maintain or build up reservoir pressure through an injection well in an oil reservoir. Oil wells receive credit for gas injected and reported as "Repressuring and Pressure Maintenance."

Cycling

Normally gas returned to gas cycling projects (gas reservoir or gas cap of associated reservoir) after extraction of hydrocarbon liquids. Gas wells receive credit for gas injected and reported as "Cycled".

Underground Storage

Gas injected into underground storage.

Carbon Black Plant

Gas delivered to a gas Carbon Black Plant.

Other Processing Plants

Gas that is delivered to another gas processing plant or facility being reported on Form GP-1. Gas delivered to Industrial Plants (not reported on Form GP-1) should be reported to Transmission Line.

Transmission Line

Gas used for industrial purposes, irrigation fuel, refinery fuel, etc.

Meter Difference

Difference that occurs within the plants.

Total

Total disposition must balance and agree with total reported on Line 12, Section I.

SECTION IV: SULFUR AND CO_2 RECOVERY

Report in Long Tons and/or Standard Barrels.

You are reminded to complete all sections of Form GP-1 for treating plants whether or not liquid hydrocarbons are recovered. This information is needed for statistical purposes.

SECTION V: PLANT LIQUID HYDROCARBON PRODUCTION

Report all liquid production in this Section and Section VII. The "Total" (Line 9) should reflect total liquid recovery of the system, and production reported as "Condensate From Gas Well Gas" and "Drip and/or Scrubber Oil From Casinghead Gas" must be included. Total on Line 9, Section V, must balance and agree with total reported on Line 5, Section VII. Consider allocated scrubber oil a detail sub-total of the amount of scrubber oil shown on the line above.

Condensate From Gas Well Gas

Drip and/or condensate production from gas well gas when Form GP-1 is used for reporting liquids. Do not report any condensate production on Form P-2 that is reported on Form GP-1.

Drip and/or Scrubber Oil From Casinghead Gas

Scrubber oil recovered in excess of 0.75 barrel per well per month (Statewide Rule 56) is not allowable free and must be allocated back to the oil leases where produced and reported as production by the operator on Form P-1. Disposition of scrubber oil allocated back to leases may be made in the "Other Column" on Form P-1 with 5* as the code. Explanation of 5* (Lost in Casinghead Gas System) should be shown on Form. Furnish this office with an original and one copy of your allocation of excess scrubber oil. List field, operator, lease name, RRC lease number, and number of barrels allocated.

"Drip and/or Scrubber Oil produced in excess of Statewide Rule 56 and allocated back to leases for operator to report on Form P-1" is only a sub-total or detail amount and the liquids shown as such should be included under "Drip and/or Scrubber Oil From Casinghead Gas" in the line above.

Plant Condensate

Report in this category only under conditions approved by the Commission.

"Plant Condensate" and "Condensate From Gas Well Gas" may be combined as production and deliveries in Section VII.

Hydrocarbon Mixtures

For statistical purposes, report the components of any Hydrocarbon or LPG mixes in Section V and Section VII. You may state that product is delivered as a mix in Section VIII.

SECTION VI: DETAIL OF DRIP OR SCRUBBER RECOVERY

This section is to be used to show the detailed scrubber recovery when filing a "System" report.

The name of drip or scrubber, wells, and barrels of liquid recovered from these facilities must be reported in this section, and the wells and liquid production will also be included in Sections I and V above. See examples for proper reporting of these facilities.

SECTION VII AND SECTION VIII: LIQUID OPERATIONS (RECEIPTS, PRODUCTION, AND DELIVERIES)

Report actual product received in Section VIII. If product received is fractionated, the components may be reported on Line 4, Section VII, and included in "Deliveries".

Do not include any products received in the production sections (Section V and Section VII). Production should be only those products extracted from natural gas taken into the plant for processing.

Do not include LPG in underground storage in your plant opening and closing inventories. You may report the initial production of product and include the amount to storage in "Deliveries". Any further Storage Tabulation (Injection, withdrawals, and accumulated balances should be reported on a supplemental sheet.

SECTION IX: REPORT OF GAS INJECTED - REPRESSURING, PRESSURE MAINTENANCE, CYCLING AND UNDERGROUND STORAGE

Report volume of gas returned to reservoirs for each injection well.

If more space is needed, use Form GP-3.

SECTION X: DETAIL OF DELIVERY OF GAS-EXCEPT FUEL SYSTEM AND LEASE USE

Use the proper column for reporting delivery of gas. "Unprocessed Gas" column should be used for dispostion reported in Section II and "Residue Gas" column for disposition reported in Section III.

Complete section even though no delivery or sale of transmission line gas is made.

SECTION XI: REMARKS

State the reason for venting unprocessed and residue gas.

Whenever a report is final, show "Final Report". Do not state report is final if there is a closing inventory of stock reported in Section VII. Form GP-1 must be continued until stock has been disposed of.

Also, note any change in the plant operating name and show the effective date of change.

1

MONTHLY REPORT FOR GAS PROCESSING PLANTS

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS
OIL AND GAS DIVISION

FORM GP-1
Rev. 10/68

SERIAL NO. 3-1501

DISTRICT NO. 3
FOR THE MONTH OF January 19 69
OPERATOR Total Production Company
ADDRESS P.O. Box 1340-Austin, Texas 78720
PLANT NAME Blanche
SYSTEM NAME Blanche
FIELDS ABC & Blanche
COUNTY Orange
TYPE OF PLANT Gasoline
DAILY AVERAGE INTAKE CAPACITY OF PLANT 170,000
AVG. INTAKE PRESSURE 800 P.S.I.A.
AVG TESTED GPM 1.420
RECOVERED GPM 1.649

REPORT ALL GAS VOLUMES IN MCF AT 14.65 PSIA PRESSURE AND 60° FAHRENHEIT IN ACCORDANCE WITH GAS MEASUREMENT LAW.

Section I: Intake Volumes (MCF monthly)	GAS WELL GAS	CASINGHEAD	TOTAL
1. NO. OF WELLS PRODUCED	80	750	830
INTO GATHERING SYSTEM	2,500,025	1,201,419	3,701,444
VERIES FROM GATHERING SYSTEM	150,725	30,900	181,625
ERING SYSTEM TO PLANT FOR PROCESSING	2,349,300	1,170,519	3,519,819
INTAKE – FROM PLANT METERS	2,345,409	1,172,043	3,517,452
OR GAIN – DIFF. BETWEEN LINES 4 & 5	3,891	1,524	2,367
VERY AND STORAGE VAPORS			
FROM OTHER PROCESSING PLANTS	J & J Gas Company - Plant No. 3		204,671
GAS FROM MAIN TRANSMISSION LINE	M & W Pipeline Company		300,960
10. GAS WITHDRAWN FROM STORAGE			
11. GAS IMPORTED FROM OTHER STATES	Louisiana		10,009
GAS TO PLANT FOR PROCESSING			4,033,092

II: Disposition of Unprocessed Gas from Gathering System (MCF monthly)	GAS WELL GAS	CASINGHEAD	TOTAL
FUEL SYSTEM AND LEASE USE	20,450	1,982	22,432
LIFT	10,465	12,563	23,028
3. REPRESSURING & PRESSURE MAINTENANCE	22,040	15,071	37,111
4. CYCLED			
UNDERGROUND STORAGE			
6. OTHER PROCESSING PLANTS	97,770		97,770
7. CARBON BLACK PLANTS			
NSMISSION LINE			
VENTED		1,284	1,284
	150,725	30,900	181,625

SECTION III: Disposition of Residue Gas (MCF monthly)

1. EXTRACTION LOSS	173,539	6. GAS LIFT	24,455	11. OTHER PROCESS. PLANTS	
LOSS	11,025	7. REPRESS & PRESS MAINT		12. TRANSMISSION LINE	3,637,461
LOSS		8. CYCLED		13. VENTED	
FUEL	150,193	9. UNDERGROUND STORAGE		14. METER DIFFERENCE	7,491
FUEL & USE	28,928	10. CARBON BLACK PLANTS		15. TOTAL	4,033,092

IV: Sulfur and CO2 Recovery

TION OF SULFUR FROM PROCESSING NATURAL GAS 100 (Long) TONS. CO_2 - BBLS. TONS

SECTION V. Plant Liquid Hydrocarbon Production (barrels monthly)

CONDENSATE FROM GAS WELL GAS 195
DRIP AND/OR SCRUBBER OIL FROM CASINGHEAD GAS 335
Drip and/or Scrubber Oil produced in excess of Statewide Rule 56 and allocated back to leases for operator to report on Form P-1. 94

1. PLANT CONDENSATE	1,044	4. PROPANE	38,000	7. ETHANE	41,258
GASOLINE	50,550	5. BUTANE PROPANE MIX.		8.	
BUTANE	25,133	6. ISO-BUTANE	2,345	9. TOTAL	158,860

VI: Detail of Drip or Scrubber Recovery (Production included above)

NAME OF DRIP OR SCRUBBER	NO. OF GAS WELLS	NO. OF OIL WELLS	BARRELS
Jameson Compressor Station	10	415	324
Larimore Compressor Plant	0	21	110
Scrubber No. 1	12	4	36
Scrubber No. 2	10	0	60
Attachment If Necessary)		TOTAL	530

SECTION VII: Barrels

	Condensate	Drip and/or Scrubber Oil	Gasoline	Butane	Propane	Ethane	ISO-Butane Other	Total
1. OPENING BALANCE	201	15	10,019	6,045	3,041	2,055	0	21,376
2. FROZEN STOCK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. TOTAL OPENING STOCK	201	15	10,019	6,045	3,041	2,055	0	21,376
4. RECEIVED	52	0	3,015	5,038	3,049	1,151	0	12,305
5. PRODUCED	1239	335	50,550	25,133	38,000	41,258	2,345	158,860
6. DELIVERED	1442	330	56,989	31,952	38,054	39,767	2,345	170,879
7. LOSS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. TOTAL CLOSING STOCK	50	20	6,595	4,264	6,036	4,697	0	21,662
9. FROZEN STOCK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. CLOSING BALANCE	50	20	6,595	4,264	6,036	4,697	0	21,662

SECTION VIII: Liquid Operations Statement

RECEIPTS			DELIVERIES		
Received from	Commodity	Barrels Received	Delivered to	Commodity	Barrels Delivered
E & S Gas Co.	Hydrocarbon Mix	12,305	L & D Oil Co.	Ethane	39,767
			DXL Oil Company	Condensate	1,442
			do	Scrubber oil	330
			T & P Oil Company	Gasoline	56,989
			do	Butane	31,952
			do Pro	& Iso But Mix	40,399
TOTALS					170,879

SECTION IX: Report of Gas Injected – Repressuring, Pressure Maintenance, Cycling, and Underground Storage

Field and Reservoir	Well Owner	Lease	Well No.	Injection Pressure	MCF Monthly
Blanche /A-1/	Total Production Co.	Ward "A"	1	2600	37,111
		Total		xxxxxxx	37,111

SECTION X: Detail of Delivery of Gas – Except Fuel System and Lease Use (MCF monthly)

Delivered to Whom	Use or Disposition	Unprocessed Gas (Sec. II)	Residue Gas (Sec. III)
J & J Gas Company (Day Plant)	Processing	97,770	
B & H Transmission Co.	Transmission Line		3,623,363
Farmers' Co-OP	Irrigation		14,098

SECTION XI: Remarks

1. REASON FOR VENTING UNPROCESSED GAS Compressor Down
2. REASON FOR VENTING RESIDUE GAS
3.

CERTIFICATE: I, the undersigned, state that I am the Plant Superintendent (TITLE) of the Total Production Co. (COMPANY AND PLANT) and that I am authorized by said company to make this report, and that this report was prepared under my supervision and direction and that the facts stated therein are true, correct and complete to the best of my knowledge.

2-20-69
Date

T.P. Vitek T. P. Vitek
Signature

512-475-3803
Area Code and Telephone Number

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. This report shall be filed in four (4) duplicate originals with the District Director of the Railroad Commission of Texas for the District in which the Plant is located as soon after the first of the Month as possible for the preceding Month, and never later than the Twenty-Fifth of the month.
2. This report is required of all Plants processing Natural Gas. All Gas Volumes must be reported at a Base Pressure of 14.65 pounds per square inch absolute and a Base Temperature of 60 degrees Fahrenheit. All liquid quantities shown on this report shall be in barrels of 42 U.S. Gallons based on actual physical gauges computed from 100% U.S. Tank Tables or other method of measurement approved by the Commission and corrected from the temperature at the time of measurement to a standard temperature of 60 degrees Fahrenheit. Do not use fractions of thousands of cubic feet of gas, or fractions of barrels of liquid on this report.
3. Detailed instructions available from Railroad Commission of Texas, Oil & Gas Division, Production & Proration Section, P.O. Drawer EE, Austin, Texas 78711.

3

MONTHLY REPORT FOR GAS PROCESSING PLANTS

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS
OIL AND GAS DIVISION

FORM GP-1
Rev. 10/68

SERIAL NO. 3-100

DISTRICT NO. 3
FOR THE MONTH OF January, 19 69
OPERATOR Total Production Co.
ADDRESS P.O.Box 1340-Austin, Texas 78720
PLANT NAME Val
SYSTEM NAME T & P Oil Co. Plant #1
FIELDS Val
COUNTY Brazoria
TYPE OF PLANT Compressor Station
DAILY AVERAGE INTAKE CAPACITY OF PLANT 35,000
AVG. INTAKE PRESSURE ______ P.S.I.A. AVG. TESTED GPM ______ RECOVERED GPM ______

REPORT ALL GAS VOLUMES IN MCF AT 14.65 PSIA PRESSURE AND 60° FAHRENHEIT IN ACCORDANCE WITH GAS MEASUREMENT LAW.

Section I: Intake Volumes (MCF monthly)	GAS WELL GAS	CASINGHEAD	TOTAL
1. NO. OF WELLS PRODUCED	10	130	140
GAS INTO GATHERING SYSTEM	325,096	500,045	825,141
DELIVERIES FROM GATHERING SYSTEM	5,230	25,093	30,323
GATHERING SYSTEM TO PLANT FOR PROCESSING	319,866	474,952	794,818
PLANT INTAKE – FROM PLANT METERS	319,866	474,952	794,818
LOSS OR GAIN – DIFF. BETWEEN LINES 4 & 5			
REFINERY AND STORAGE VAPORS			
GAS FROM OTHER PROCESSING PLANTS			
9. GAS FROM MAIN TRANSMISSION LINE			
10. GAS WITHDRAWN FROM STORAGE			
11. GAS IMPORTED FROM OTHER STATES			
NET GAS TO PLANT FOR PROCESSING			794,818

SECTION II: Disposition of Unprocessed Gas from Gathering System (MCF monthly)	GAS WELL GAS	CASINGHEAD	TOTAL
FUEL SYSTEM AND LEASE USE	5,230	5,090	10,320
GAS LIFT		4,950	4,950
3. REPRESSURING & PRESSURE MAINTENANCE			
CYCLED			
UNDERGROUND STORAGE			
6. OTHER PROCESSING PLANTS		15,053	15,053
7. CARBON BLACK PLANTS			
TRANSMISSION LINE			
VENTED			
TOTAL	5,230	25,093	30,323

SECTION III: Disposition of Residue Gas (MCF monthly)

1. EXTRACTION LOSS	282	6. GAS LIFT		11. OTHER PROCESS. PLANTS	150,666
H_2S LOSS		7. REPRESS & PRESS MAINT		12. TRANSMISSION LINE	566,893
CO_2 LOSS		8. CYCLED		13. VENTED	
PLANT FUEL	22,090	9. UNDERGROUND STORAGE		14. METER DIFFERENCE	(-),547
LEASE FUEL & USE	55,434	10 CARBON BLACK PLANTS		15. TOTAL	794,818

SECTION IV: Sulfur and CO2 Recovery

PRODUCTION OF SULFUR FROM PROCESSING NATURAL GAS ______ TONS. CO_2 ______ BBLS. TONS

SECTION V. Plant Liquid Hydrocarbon Production (barrels monthly)

CONDENSATE FROM GAS WELL GAS 110 DRIP AND/OR SCRUBBER OIL FROM CASINGHEAD GAS 165

Drip and/or Scrubber Oil produced in excess of Statewide Rule 56 and allocated back to leases for operator to report on Form P-1. 67

1. PLANT CONDENSATE		4. PROPANE		7. ETHANE	
2. GASOLINE		5. BUTANE-PROPANE MIX.		8. ______	
3. BUTANE		6. ISO-BUTANE		9. TOTAL	275

SECTION VI: Detail of Drip or Scrubber Recovery (Production included above)

NAME OF DRIP OR SCRUBBER	NO. OF GAS WELLS	NO. OF OIL WELLS	BARRELS
Attachment if Necessary		TOTAL	

Reproduced from best available copy.

SECTION VII: Barrels

	Condensate	Drip and/or Scrubber Oil	Gasoline	Butane	Propane	Ethane	Other	Total
1. OPENING BALANCE	100	50						150
2. FROZEN STOCK	0	0						0
3. TOTAL OPENING STOCK	100	50						150
4. RECEIVED	0	0						0
5. PRODUCED	110	165						275
6. DELIVERED	150	140						290
7. LOSS	0	0						0
8. TOTAL CLOSING STOCK	60	75						135
9. FROZEN STOCK	0	0						0
10. CLOSING BALANCE	60	75						135

SECTION VIII: Liquid Operations Statement

RECEIPTS			DELIVERIES		
Received from	Commodity	Barrels Received	Delivered to	Commodity	Barrels Delivered
			DXL Oil Co.	Condensate	150
			do	Scrubber Oil	140
TOTALS					290

SECTION IX: Report of Gas Injected – Repressuring, Pressure Maintenance, Cycling, and Underground Storage

Field and Reservoir	Well Owner	Lease	Well No.	Injection Pressure	MCF Monthly
		Total		xxxxxxx	

SECTION X: Detail of Delivery of Gas – Except Fuel System and Lease Use (MCF monthly)

Delivered to Whom	Use or Disposition	Unprocessed Gas (Sec. II)	Residue Gas (Sec. III)
J & W Gas Co.-Bexar Plant	Processing Plant	15,053	
T & P Oil Company-Plant #1	Processing Plant		150,666
D & L Pipeline Co.	TransmissionLine		566,893

SECTION XI: Remarks

1. REASON FOR VENTING UNPROCESSED GAS
2. REASON FOR VENTING RESIDUE GAS
3.

CERTIFICATE: I, the undersigned, state that I am the Plant Superintendent (TITLE) of the Total Production Co. (COMPANY AND PLANT) and that I am authorized by said company to make this report, and that this report was prepared under my supervision and direction and that the facts stated therein are true, correct and complete to the best of my knowledge.

2-20-69 T. P. Vitek 512-475-3803

Date Signature Area Code and Telephone Number

INSTRUCTIONS

1. This report shall be filed in four (4) duplicate originals with the District Director of the Railroad Commission of Texas for the District in which the Plant is located as soon after the first of the Month as possible for the preceding Month, and never later than the Twenty-Fifth of the month.
2. This report is required of all Plants processing Natural Gas. All Gas Volumes must be reported at a Base Pressure of 14.65 pounds per square inch absolute and a Base Temperature of 60 degrees Fahrenheit. All liquid quantities shown on this report shall be in barrels of 42 U.S. Gallons based on actual physical gauges computed from 100% U.S. Tank Tables or other method of measurement approved by the Commission and corrected from the temperature at the time of measurement to a standard temperature of 60 degrees Fahrenheit. Do not use fractions of thousands of cubic feet of gas, or fractions of barrels of liquid on this report.
3. Detailed instructions available from Railroad Commission of Texas, Oil & Gas Division, Production & Proration Section, P.O. Drawer EE, Austin, Texas 78711

5

MONTHLY REPORT FOR
AS PROCESSING PLANTS

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS
OIL AND GAS DIVISION

FORM GP-1
Rev. 10/68

SERIAL NO. 3-409

DISTRICT NO. 3
FOR THE MONTH OF January, 19 69
ERATOR Total Pipe Line Company
ADDRESS P.O.Box 1340-Austin, Texas 78720
NAME Main Transmission Line Drip Stations
NAME Arkansas Delivery
ELDS
COUNTY
PE OF PLANT Mainline Drips
DAILY AVERAGE INTAKE CAPACITY OF PLANT
VG. INTAKE PRESSURE P.S.I.A. AVG. TESTED GPM RECOVERED GPM

EPORT ALL GAS VOLUMES IN MCF AT 14.65 PSIA PRESSURE AND 60° FAHRENHEIT IN ACCORDANCE WITH GAS MEASUREMENT LAW.

Section I: Intake Volumes (MCF monthly)	GAS WELL GAS	CASINGHEAD	TOTAL
OF WELLS PRODUCED			
S INTO GATHERING SYSTEM			
LIVERIES FROM GATHERING SYSTEM			
THERING SYSTEM TO PLANT FOR PROCESSING			
ANT INTAKE – FROM PLANT METERS			
SS OR GAIN – DIFF. BETWEEN LINES 4 & 5			
REFINERY AND STORAGE VAPORS			
AS FROM OTHER PROCESSING PLANTS			
9. GAS FROM MAIN TRANSMISSION LINE			
10. GAS WITHDRAWN FROM STORAGE			
AS IMPORTED FROM OTHER STATES			
ET GAS TO PLANT FOR PROCESSING			

ECTION II: Disposition of Unprocessed Gas from Gathering System (MCF monthly)	GAS WELL GAS	CASINGHEAD	TOTAL
FUEL SYSTEM AND LEASE USE			
2. GAS LIFT			
REPRESSURING & PRESSURE MAINTENANCE			
CYCLED			
5. UNDERGROUND STORAGE			
6. OTHER PROCESSING PLANTS			
ARBON BLACK PLANTS			
RANSMISSION LINE			
NTED			
OTAL			

ECTION III: Disposition of Residue Gas (MCF monthly)

TRACTION LOSS		6. GAS LIFT		11. OTHER PROCESS. PLANTS	
LOSS		7. REPRESS & PRESS MAINT		12. TRANSMISSION LINE	
$_2$ LOSS		8. CYCLED		13. VENTED	
ANT FUEL		9. UNDERGROUND STORAGE		14. METER DIFFERENCE	
ASE FUEL & USE		10. CARBON BLACK PLANTS		15. TOTAL	

N IV: Sulfur and CO2 Recovery

DUCTION OF SULFUR FROM PROCESSING NATURAL GAS TONS. CO_2 BBLS. TONS

CTION V. Plant Liquid Hydrocarbon Production (barrels monthly)

CONDENSATE FROM GAS WELL GAS Mainline DRIP AND/OR SCRUBBER OIL XXXXXXXXXXXXX 645

Drip and/or Scrubber Oil produced in excess of Statewide Rule 56 and allocated back to leases for operator to report on Form P-1.

1. PLANT CONDENSATE		4. PROPANE		7. ETHANE	
ASOLINE		5. BUTANE-PROPANE MIX.		8.	
UTANE		6. ISO-BUTANE		9. TOTAL	645

CTION VI: Detail of Drip or Scrubber Recovery (Production included above)

OF DRIP OR SCRUBBER	NO. OF GAS WELLS	NO. OF OIL WELLS	BARRELS
Main Line Drip No. 1			245
Main Line Drip No. 2			290
ain Line Drip No. 3			110
Attachment If Necessary)		TOTAL	645

3-22

6

SECTION VII: Barrels

	Drip Condensate	Drip and/or Scrubber Oil	Gasoline	Butane	Propane	Ethane	Other	Total
1. OPENING BALANCE	75							75
2. FROZEN STOCK	0							0
3. TOTAL OPENING STOCK	75							75
4. RECEIVED	0							0
5. PRODUCED	645							645
6. DELIVERED	573							573
7. LOSS	0							0
8. TOTAL CLOSING STOCK	147							147
9. FROZEN STOCK	0							0
10. CLOSING BALANCE	147							147

SECTION VIII: Liquid Operations Statement

RECEIPTS			DELIVERIES		
Received from	Commodity	Barrels Received	Delivered to	Commodity	Barrels Delivered
			DXL Oil Company	Drip Condensate	573
TOTALS					573

SECTION IX: Report of Gas Injected – Repressuring, Pressure Maintenance, Cycling, and Underground Storage

Field and Reservoir	Well Owner	Lease	Well No.	Injection Pressure	MCF Monthly
		Total		xxxxxxx	

SECTION X: Detail of Delivery of Gas – Except Fuel System and Lease Use (MCF monthly)

Delivered to Whom	Use or Disposition	Unprocessed Gas (Sec. II)	Residue Gas (Sec. III)

SECTION XI: Remarks

1. REASON FOR VENTING UNPROCESSED GAS ____
2. REASON FOR VENTING RESIDUE GAS ____
3. ____

CERTIFICATE: I, the undersigned, state that I am the Superintendent (TITLE) of the Total Pipe Line Co. (COMPANY AND PLANT) and that I am authorized by said company to make this report, and that this report was prepared under my supervision and direction and that the facts stated therein are true, correct and complete to the best of my knowledge.

2-20-69
Date

T. P. Vitek
Signature

512-475-3803
Area Code and Telephone Number

INSTRUCTIONS

1. This report shall be filed in four (4) duplicate originals with the District Director of the Railroad Commission of Texas for the District in which the Plant is located as soon after the first of the Month as possible for the preceding Month and never later than the Twenty-Fifth of the month.
2. This report is required of all Plants processing Natural Gas. All Gas Volumes must be reported at a Base Pressure of 14.65 pounds per square inch absolute and a Base Temperature of 60 degrees Fahrenheit. All liquid quantities shown on this report shall be in barrels of 42 U.S. Gallons based on actual physical gauges computed from 100% U.S. Tank Tables or other method of measurement approved by the Commission and corrected from the temperature at the time of measurement to a standard temperature of 60 degrees Fahrenheit. Do not use fractions of thousands of cubic feet of gas, or fractions of barrels of liquid on this report.
3. Detailed instructions available from Railroad Commission of Texas, Oil & Gas Division, Production & Proration Section, P.O. Drawer EE, Austin, Texas 78711.

Reproduced from best available copy.

TABLE NO. 8

ULTIMATE DISPOSITION OF ALL GAS PRODUCTION

ALL GAS VOLUMES REPORTED AT A STANDARD BASE PRESSURE OF 14.65 P. S. I. ABSOLUTE AND A STANDARD BASE PRESSURE OF 60° F.

YEAR 1972

Month	Extraction Loss*	Acid Gas H_2S & CO_2	Plant Fuel & Lease Use	Pressure Maint. & Repress'g	Transmission Lines	Cycled	Carbon Black	Under-ground Storage	Vented or Flared	Plant Meter Difference	Total Gas Produced▲	Marketed Production●
January	38,114,452	15,504,425	49,700,167	36,736,122	635,534,249	33,174,044	1,816,850	589,941	5,418,894	2,256,722	820,845,866	687,051,266
February	37,447,606	14,471,379	47,308,265	36,311,949	604,377,782	31,734,208	1,616,217	178,676	4,950,100	3,213,726	781,809,908	653,302,264
March	40,987,871	13,957,616	49,845,209	39,690,974	626,846,173	33,117,591	1,776,921	2,602,804	5,487,332	3,470,880	817,783,371	678,468,303
April	39,163,207	13,450,660	48,021,966	40,734,120	608,432,611	30,890,796	1,690,837	3,536,118	5,470,126	4,414,678	795,795,119	658,145,414
May	41,061,892	13,816,664	49,544,371	43,694,854	609,308,677	30,265,683	1,744,284	2,777,998	5,108,004	3,721,393	801,644,330	660,597,832
June	39,148,724	13,962,106	47,767,291	40,933,158	595,429,950	28,754,956	1,589,956	1,378,580	5,407,045	4,759,223	779,130,990	644,787,197
July	40,683,071	15,490,181	49,709,046	39,842,497	622,081,173	29,341,099	1,758,238	2,054,569	5,130,865	5,234,965	811,341,704	673,548,457
August	39,958,511	15,225,391	50,314,496	39,225,747	615,685,794	29,758,757	1,723,305	1,149,821	5,405,631	5,186,515	803,633,668	667,723,595
September	38,862,447	15,127,762	47,944,534	39,447,510	599,580,965	29,645,395	1,532,433	1,106,350	4,653,850	4,186,313	782,087,559	649,057,932
October	40,143,319	15,395,970	48,285,339	39,038,318	621,345,064	31,017,916	1,694,587	2,119,746	4,701,868	2,277,115	807,019,242	672,324,990
November	38,531,630	15,689,858	48,701,671	36,086,303	611,306,547	28,576,004	1,764,982	427,844	4,206,066	2,047,270	787,338,175	661,773,200
December	38,560,262	15,948,219	50,544,262	36,842,037	635,353,277	29,896,890	1,626,268	345,076	4,202,206	881,200	814,199,697	687,523,807
TOTAL	472,672,992	178,040,231	588,687,117	470,583,590	7,385,482,263	366,773,340	20,334,878	18,257,223	60,147,987	41,650,000	9,602,629,629	7,994,504,260
Percent of Total	4.92	1.86	6.13	4.90	76.91	3.82	0.21	0.19	0.63	0.43		

* *Extraction Loss is shrinkage in Gas Volumes due to removal of Liquefiable Hydrocarbons.*

● *Marketed Production is the total gas to Transmission Lines, Carbon Black, and Plant Fuel and Lease Use.*

▲ *Disposition Volumes not adjusted for corrected reports.*

TABLE NO. 8

ULTIMATE DISPOSITION OF ALL GAS PRODUCTION

ALL GAS VOLUMES REPORTED AT A STANDARD BASE PRESSURE OF 14.65 P. S. I. ABSOLUTE AND A STANDARD BASE TEMPERATURE OF 60° F.

YEAR 1973

Month	Extraction Loss	Acid Gas H_2S & CO_2	Plant Fuel & Lease Use	Pressure Maint. & Repressuring	Transmission Lines	Cycled	Carbon Black	Under-ground Storage	Vented or Flared	Plant Meter Difference	Total Gas Produced▲	Marketed Production●
January	37,697,524	15,777,164	49,335,153	35,505,601	635,661,881	28,470,078	1,478,334	421,859	4,104,446	3,274,904	811,726,944	686,475,368
February	35,304,766	14,349,999	45,276,423	32,991,150	574,207,298	25,421,154	1,438,657	879,127	3,403,545	3,349,114	736,621,233	620,922,378
March	39,805,353	14,579,654	49,286,303	36,608,088	617,793,864	28,195,645	1,607,403	3,097,865	3,953,192	5,129,672	800,057,039	668,687,570
April	37,698,091	14,256,181	47,543,559	35,942,933	590,810,955	28,627,598	1,543,825	4,280,032	3,696,334	3,008,205	767,407,713	639,898,339
May	40,575,118	15,150,519	49,131,933	36,560,534	599,620,372	28,069,830	1,753,922	6,210,885	3,864,398	6,385,259	787,322,770	650,506,227
June	38,372,458	14,976,282	46,629,823	34,999,058	585,315,798	26,768,542	1,675,424	5,536,299	3,519,646	6,163,282	763,956,612	633,621,045
July	39,033,978	15,736,969	48,486,979	35,380,707	613,504,373	26,890,889	1,542,090	4,054,529	3,544,681	6,592,618	795,567,813	663,533,442
August	39,302,092	15,801,873	48,498,697	35,859,414	612,661,673	26,544,922	1,541,353	3,662,547	3,338,991	7,764,674	794,976,236	662,701,723
September	38,991,005	15,096,559	46,855,424	34,105,038	583,389,464	26,468,785	1,636,029	4,002,624	3,190,387	5,364,184	759,099,499	631,880,917
October	40,188,312	15,192,628	47,941,408	34,496,083	599,783,095	27,581,986	1,631,127	3,552,615	3,092,190	3,453,065	776,912,509	649,355,630
November	39,066,656	15,105,615	46,894,236	33,412,900	589,194,096	25,380,270	1,268,326	3,152,396	2,984,905	2,778,734	759,438,130	637,356,658
December	39,307,601	15,378,879	48,807,982	33,569,934	616,478,377	25,951,832	1,469,291	853,291	3,199,202	2,580,100	787,596,489	666,755,650
TOTAL	466,142,954	181,402,322	574,687,920	419,431,440	7,218,421,246	324,571,531	18,585,781	39,704,069	41,891,917	55,843,807	9,340,682,987	7,811,694,947
Percent of Total	4.99	1.94	6.15	4.49	77.28	3.47	0.20	0.43	0.45	0.60		

* *Extraction Loss is shrinkage in Gas Volumes due to removal of Liquefiable Hydrocarbons.*

● *Marketed Production is the total gas to Transmission Lines, Carbon Black, and Plant Fuel and Lease Use.*

▲ *Disposition Volumes not adjusted for corrected reports.*

OIL & GAS JOURNAL
P. O. Box 1260
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101

1974 ANNUAL GAS-PROCESSING PLANT SURVEY

COMPANY ____________ YOUR NAME ____________ YOUR TITLE ____________

YOUR OFFICE ADDRESS ____________ CITY ____________ STATE ____________

List all plants processing natural gas and short-cycle adsorption units, including dehydrators from which hydrocarbons are recovered. List partnership plants only if you're the operator. Report only individual streams which you make in your plant.

EXISTING PLANTS

LOCATION (For legal description give section-township-range or section-block-survey.)	GAS CAPACITY (MMcf daily)	GAS THROUGHPUT (MMcf daily)	CYCLING Yes or No	PROCESS METHOD 1–Absorp. only 2–Refrig.–abs. 3–Refrig. only 4–Compress. only 5–Adsorption	PRODUCTION – Gallons per day. Base average on production the past 12 months: Ethane	Propane	Iso-butane	Normal or unsplit butane	Ethane–Propane mix (give % of each)	Report only if produced as such: LP–gas mix	Report only if produced as such: RawNGL mix	Debut. nat. gaso.*	Other 1. Isopentane 2. Upgraded motor fuel 3. Diesel 4. Kerosine . List others
Plant name: Field: County: State: Legal de- scription:				1– 2– 3– 4– 5–									1– 2– 12. Sulfur (LT/d 3– 4– –
Plant name: Field: County: State: Legal de- scription:				1– 2– 3– 4– 5–									1– 2– 3– 4– –
Plant name: Field: County: State: Legal de- scription:				1– 2– 3– 4– 5–									1– 2– 3– 4– –

* Pentanes plus

NEW PLANTS OR EXPANSIONS UNDER CONSTRUCTION OR PLANNED

LOCATION	STATUS	NEW CAPACITY BEING ADDED (MMcfd)	PRODUCTS & CAPACITIES Gallons per day	COMPLETION month–year	CONTRACTOR	PROCESS METHOD	REMARKS: Cost etc.

(Use back side if more space is needed for new construction)

Page 2
(New plant or expansion continued....)

LOCATION	STATUS	NEW CAPACITY BEING ADDED (MMcfd)	PRODUCTS & CAPACITIES Gallons per day	COMPLETION month—year	CONTRACTOR	PROCESS METHOD	REMARKS: Cost etc.

PLEASE LIST SHUT DOWN PLANTS HERE (note if sold and to whom)

Plant name: __________
Field: __________
County: __________
State: ______ Legal description: __________

New owner __________
Address __________

Plant name: __________
Field: __________
County: __________
State: ______ Legal description: __________

New owner __________
Address __________

Plant name: __________
Field: __________
County: __________
State: ______ Legal description: __________

New owner __________
Address __________

Appendix 4. ECOLOGY AUDITS, INC. DATA FORMS

No. 1

______ STATE / 1. ______ COUNTY 2. ______ 3. ______ 4. ______

ECOLOGY AUDITS, INC.
9995 Monroe Dr · Dallas, Texas 75220
(214) 350-7893
Subsidiary of Core Laboratories, Inc

				SERVICE CO.	AIR AGENCY YEAR ___ EMISSIONS					PETROLEUM REG AGENCY								
										GAS PROCESSING PLANTS					UNPROCESSED GAS			
COMPANY	FIELD	PLANT	G/O	%H_2S	SO_2 T/Y S T/Y	H_2S T/Y S T/Y	OIL & GAS JOURNAL SULFUR CAPACITY TONS/DAY T/Y	BUREAU OF MINES SULFUR CAPACITY TONS/DAY T/Y	TOTAL PLANT INTAKE MMCF	H_2S LOSS MMCF S T/Y	AV H_2S CONTENT %	SULFUR PRODUCTION T/Y	FUEL USE MMCF	EST H_2S MMCF S T/Y	VENTED MMCF	EST H_2S MMCF S T/Y	REMARKS

No. 2

COMPANY____________________________ PLANT__________________________________

long tons
sulfur/year

Oil & Gas Journal reported capacity long tons/day__________X 365 ________

GP-1 Data - 12 mos. 1973 - Sulfur Production ________

Gas Plant Intake MMCF __________

H_2S Loss MMCF __________ X 37.48 long tons/MMCF= ________

H_2S as mol % of Intake ________

Apparent Sulfur Recovery __________ %

Unprocessed Gas

Fuel Use MMCF __________

Vented MMCF __________

Total __________

Assumed H_2S mol% __________

H_2S Loss: MMCF __________ X 37.48 long tons/MMCF= ________

Total Apparent Emissions - Processed and unprocessed Gas ________

Texas Air Control Board Data - 1973

SO_2 Emissions ________ tons/year x .4464 long tons/ton SO_2 emission ________

H_2S Emissions ________ tons/year x .8403 long tons/ton H_2S emission ________

Total atmospheric emission - sulfur compounds.......... ________

No. 3

__________ / 1. __________ 2. __________ 3. __________
State / County County

____
AQCR

"A = ± 10%
B = ± 25%
C = + 200% - 50%

Company	**Plant**	**Intake MMCF/Y**	**Range of H_2S %**	**Range of Sulfur Produced LT/YR**	**Sulfur Recovered LT/YR**	**Sulfur Emitted**			
						As Reported To State	**As Re-estimated In Survey**	**As Estimated by Ecol. Audit**	
Total									
County Data Sulfur Plants									

Appendix 5. TABULAR DATA FOR PLANTS STUDIED

The following tables in Appendix 5 show total values only, rather than values for individual plants in the columns for "Total Intake", "% of Gas Sweetened", "H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced" and "H_2S in all Natural Gas Produced." Individual plant data would identify specific plants in many cases and violate the confidentiality of some of the information provided for the study. Much of the H_2S content data were obtained from individual operators in varying terms of percentages of H_2S and SO_2 in an acid gas stream, percent H_2S in a plant charge stream, grains of H_2S per 100 std. cu. ft. of gas plant charge or pipeline receipt, ppm of H_2S in a stream, etc. Since the objective of the present study is to evaluate total emissions of sulfur, a complete itemization of data by plant is not called for. Further, plant processing varies widely from day to day in some areas (see pages 78-80) which may make individual plant numbers misleading. As an example of cooperative operation, plants No. 2 and No. 10 of AQCR 155 send all or most of their sour gas stream to plant No. 12 for sulfur recovery. Data for these three plants should provide a balance on sulfur produced, recovered and emitted.

The average value of "H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced" was calculated for each AQCR by converting the total quantity of sulfur produced to MMSCF of H_2S and dividing this value by the total gas sweetening plant intake. Take AQCR 155 as an example:

$$\frac{108{,}100 \text{ LT/yr}}{37.48 \text{ LT/MMCF } H_2S} = 2884.2 \text{ MMCF } H_2S\text{/yr}$$ (Refer to Page 62 for explanation)

$$\frac{2884.2 \times 100}{586{,}800} = 0.49\% \; H_2S \text{ in Gas Sweetening Plant Intake}$$

The percentage of "H_2S in all Natural Gas Produced" is obtained by considering "Total Intake" rather than "Gas Sweetening Plant Intake."

Similar calculations can be made for each plant if such data are desired. As examples:

Plant No. 2, AQCR 155

$$\frac{17{,}100 \times 100}{37.48 \times 28{,}700} = 1.59\% \; H_2S \text{ in Gas Sweetening Plant Intake}$$

Plant No. 7, AQCR 155

$$\frac{6{,}600 \times 100}{37.48 \times 63{,}400} = 0.28\% \; H_2S \text{ in Gas Sweetening Plant Intake}$$

Plant No. 9, AQCR 155

$$\frac{1{,}900 \times 100}{37.48 \times 70{,}200} = 0.073\% \; H_2S \text{ in Gas Sweetening Plant Intake}$$

H_2S concentrations range from a few grains per 100 cubic feet to 16 or 18 percent of the sweetening plant intake gas to the various plants, but the total values provide the weighted average, which is the significant quantity in the present study.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR: Sulfur Produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR: Sulfur Recovered	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR: Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
155	Pecos Permian Basin	1		11.6				.1		.1
		2		28.7				17.1		--
		3		2.0				.1		.1
		4		3.9				<.1		<.1
		5		88.0				5.8		5.8
		6		--				7.1		7.1
		7		63.4				6.6		6.6
		8		62.2				1.5		1.5
		9		70.2				1.9		1.9
		10		2.0				13.1		9.5
		11		6.9				2.0		2.0
		12		--				--	18.3	2.5
		13		8.3				.3		.3
		14		24.1				.8		.8
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions										
Total										

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR		
								Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
155	Pecos Permian Basin	15		12.2				.9		.9
		16		25.3				1.7		1.7
		17		1.9				.8		.8
		18		2.8				.2		.2
		19		26.3				.9		.4
		20		13.9				1.3		1.3
		21		7.0				1.2		1.2
		22		2.6				1.0		1.0
		23		20.1				1.2		1.2
		24		12.5				1.6		1.6
		25		6.6				10.2	4.6	5.5
		26		3.1				.5		.5
		27		9.3				5.8	3.3	2.5
		28		.3				.1		.1
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions										
	Total									

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR		
								Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
155	Pecos Permian Basin	29		63.0				11.9	10.6	1.3
		30		8.6				12.4	10.9	1.5
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions - 7										
	Total	30	590	586.8	100	.49	.49	108.1	47.7	59.9

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR		
								Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
218	Midland-Odessa San Angelo	1		11.0				.4		.4
		2		24.1				2.2		2.2
		3		33.4				1.1		1.1
		4		7.3				.3		.3
		5		7.9				.7		.7
		6		19.3				.9		.9
		7		12.2				.8		.8
		8		11.0				1.0		1.0
		9		15.3				.1		.1
		10		1.6				.1		.1
		11		18.9				.2		.2
		12		5.5				.7		.7
		13		3.0				.7		.7
		14		104.7				3.5		3.5
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions										
Total										

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
218	Midland-Odessa San Angelo	15		30.1				.9		.9
		16		35.6				2.6		2.6
		17		23.0				1.6		1.6
		18		70.3				1.4		1.4
		19		unknown				.5		.5
		20		147.6				9.1	5.0	4.1
		21		3.8				1.1		1.1
		22		5.1				<.1		<.1
		23		5.0				.4		.4
		24		.7				<.1		<.1
		25		.9				<.1		<.1
		26		14.0				<.1		<.1
		27		19.7				2.6		2.6
		28		35.9				3.4		3.4
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions										
Total										

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR		
								Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
218	Midland-Odessa San Angelo	29		unknown				2.0		2.0
		30		unknown				.1		.1
		31		.9				1.8	1.0	.9
		32		2.1				.6	.5	.1
		33		3.1				.2		.2
		34		5.3				1.5		1.5
		35		1.3				.2		.2
		36		3.4				5.2	3.7	1.6
		37		120.5				.2		.2
		38		93.9				.3		.3
		39		26.3				5.7		5.7
		40		5.4				.6		.6
		41		unknown				.3		.3
		42		112.2				4.7	.7	4.0
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions										
	Total									

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR		
								Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
218	Midland-Odessa San Angelo	43		77.1				3.7		3.7
		44		126.7				.6		.6
		45		5.2				.7		.7
		46		7.4				1.2		1.2
		47		30.2				.1		.1
		48		.2				<.1		<.1
		49		18.8				.3		.3
		50		10.4				4.5		1.2
		51		10.5				9.4		1.6
		52		--					8.3	2.8
		53		.1				3		.3
		54		7.1				6.5	4.5	2.0
		55		25.2				3.3		3.3
		56		85.8				23.1	16.5	6.6
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions										
Total										

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR		
								Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
218	Midland-Odessa San Angelo	57		57.8				.1		.1
		58		unknown				.3		.3
		59		28.8				15.3	8.7	6.5
		60		unknown				1.1	1.0	.1
		61		.8				1.4	.5	.8
		62		.3				.1		.1
		63		1.0				1.9		1.9
		64		11.7				.1		.1
		65		unknown				.9		.9
		66		26.6				9.7	6.1	3.6
		67		38.4				.7		.4**
		68		55.7				18.6	14.8	3.8
		69		38.5				29.6	25.9	3.7
		70		15.8				20.2	18.2	2.0
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions										
Total										

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.
** Some is sold sour.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR		
								Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
218	Midland-Odessa San Angelo	71		6.9				2.1		2.1
		72		unknown				.7		.7
		73		7.6				2.7	1.4	1.2
		74		20.7				.8		.8
		75		3.1				.4		.4
		76		12.6				7.3	5.3	2.1
		77		11.7				4.2		1.1**
		78		unknown				--		3.2
		79		5.9				1.9	1.6	.3
		80		11.3				2.7	2.5	.2
		81		unknown				<.1		<.1
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions -		40								
	Total	81	2726.1	1801.2	66	0.35	0.23	236.4	126.2	110.0

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

** Sells some sour gas.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR		
								Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
211	Amarillo/Lubbock	1		70.1				5.1		5.1
		2		2.5				.7		.7
		3		unknown				.1		.1
		4		--				--	2.0	1.0
		5		104.5				3.5		.5
		6		13.8				.9		.9
		7		122.3				6.7	5.5	1.1
		8		7.3				.2		.2
		9		5.3				1.2		1.2
		10		--				--	.8	.3
		11		4.2				1.1		--
		12		unknown				.5		.5
		13		.9				.2		.2
		14		3.0				.3		.3
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions										
Total										

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR		
								Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
211	Amarillo/Lubbock	15		8.8				.9		.9
		16		16.2				14.8	13.7	1.1
		17		73.6				.4		.4
		18		70.0				1.2		1.2
		19		6.9				.2		.2
		20		4.5				1.4	.4	1.0
		21		6.8				.3		.3
		22		7.3				.6		.6
		23		2.3				.1		.1
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions		-12								
	Total	23	1,358.8	530.3	39	0.20	0.08	40.4	22.4	17.9

***As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.**

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR		
								Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
217	San Antonio	1		16.2				10.5	7.0	3.5
		2		2.0				1.0	1.0	--
		3		5.0				1.4	--	1.4
		4		8.3				7.1	4.6	2.6
		5		20.3				13.0	9.8	3.2
		6		19.3				10.6	--	.5
		7		--				--	9.3	.7
		8		5.0				3.5	2.6	.9
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions -		1								
	Total	8	159.0	76.1	47.9	1.65	0.79	47.1	34.3	12.8

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR: Sulfur Produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR: Sulfur Recovered	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR: Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
215	Dallas-Ft. Worth	1		3.0				2.6	.3	2.3
		2		.1				.1		.1
		3		.7				.7		.7
210	Abilene-Wichita Falls	4		5.0				.1		.1
		5		13.9				.3		.3
212	Austin-Waco	6		.9				.3		.3
		7		4.2				39.7	33.0	6.7
214	Corpus Christi	8		0.6				<.1		<.1
		9		26.8				32.6	28.4	4.2
		10		1.1				.3		.3
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions -12										
	Total	10	2455.7	56.3	2	3.63	0.008	76.7	61.7	15.0

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR		
								Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
22	Shreveport-Texarkana-Tyler	1		6.3				13.3	12.0	1.3
		2		7.1				77.0	67.4	9.6
		3		28.1				114.6	106.6	8.0
		4		3.6				.4		.4
		5		4.5				12.4	10.1	2.4
		6		2.6				2.7		2.7
		7		3.8				5.4	4.5	.9
		8		7.8				.4		.4
		9		.9				.7		.7
		10		17.1				40.1	36.6	3.5
		11		21.7				79.9	64.8	15.1
		12		2.7				2.9	2.1	.8
		13		16.0				10.9	9.6	1.4
		14		6.6				1.4	.4	1.0
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions - 4										
	Total	14	459.1	128.8	28	7.5	2.1	362.1	314.1	48.2

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Natural Gas and Sulfur Production for Air Quality Control Regions in the Study Area

AQCR	Location	Plant No.	Total Intake MMMCF/YR	Gas Sweetening Plant Intake MMMCF/YR	% of Gas Sweetened	H_2S in Sour Natural Gas as Produced	H_2S in all Natural Gas produced	Quantities in Thousand LT/YR		
								Sulfur Produced	Sulfur Recovered	Elemental Sulfur Emitted*
5	Mobile-Pensacola Panama City-So. Miss	1		.2				.4		.4
		2		.2				.7		.7
		3		.2				.2		.2
		4		.1				.1		.1
		5		.2				.1		.1
		6		10.5				153.4	150.3	3.1
		7		2.9				.1		.1
		8		4.9				2.6		2.6
		9		2.6				4.9	4.2	.7
		10		22.7				127.3	112.7	14.6
		11		13.6				77.5	73.4	4.1
		12		2.9				17.2	16.1	1.1
		13		3.1				19.7	18.4	1.4
		14		7.3				29.9	19.1	10.8
No. of plants studied with small or no sulfur emissions -		5								
	Total	14	164.6	71.4	43	16.2	7.03	434.1	394.2	40.0

*As estimated by Ecology Audits. Emitted principally as sulfur dioxide from tail gas incineration.

Appendix 6

M.W. KELLOGG'S EVALUATION OF THE ASSUMPTIONS, METHODS AND RESULTS IN IV

KELLOGG'S ROLE IN THIS STUDY

This study was authorized by EPA as part of Contract 68-02-1308, Task No. 26, change 1. The actual work was performed by Ecology Audits, Inc. During the course of the subject study Kellogg worked closely with the EPA and Ecology Audits, Inc. and reviewed the work being done.

A detailed discussion of Kellogg's evaluation of the work done under this task is presented in this section of the Appendix.

In Kellogg's opinion the methods used and the results obtained are satisfactory.

Kellogg's Review of Ecology Audits' Assumptions On Source and Disposition of Gas in Production Operations

The basis for the determination of how much emission of sulfur compounds occur from petroleum production has been shown in the flowsheet (Figure 1) used by Ecology Audits Inc. and is part of this report. M.W. Kellogg and the EPA had agreed for this to be the basis for the entire study. A similar flowsheet has been discussed in greater detail by Harold R. Jones (1).

The approach taken by Ecology Audits to estimate the total sulfur emissions has been:

"The total sulfur emissions from a plant to the atmosphere is the difference between the amount of hydrogen sulfide produced from the ground less what is recovered. The total emitted by the entire study area or an AQCR region is the sum of the emissions from the individual plants within that region."

There is further breakdown possible for how this sulfur is disposed off (vented, flared or emitted as SO_2). As far as the computation of the total amount of sulfur emission is concerned this approach is valid when the data for the total plant intake and the amount of S recovered are available.

The various sources of information that are available as public data do not contain sufficient information to compute the percentage of H_2S in the gas produced. In certain cases the data available do not appear to be reasonable. There are a number of ways in which the data have been reported to different agencies depending upon the requirements of the agency. Also, where data were missing and had to be gathered by personal contact, the data reported by the operators were in terms of grains per 100 standard cubic feet.

Different methods used for computing the various quantities are discussed and evaluated in the following pages.

Sample Calculations When Gas Analysis is Reported in Grain Per 100 Standard Cubic Feet

1 MMCF = 10,000 grains of H_2S
7,000 grains - 1 lb.

$\frac{10,000}{7,000} \times \frac{32}{34} \times \frac{1}{2240} =$ 0.000600 long tons of S per MMCF with 1 grain H_2S content.

Sample Calculations Performed by Kellogg To Evaluate Figures Obtained By Ecology Audits

Input Data

(assumed available either from public data or from the survey)

Plant Name, County, State, Plant 1 - Any County, Any State

Source GP-1 Data

Gas plant Intake	MMCF 927
H_2S Loss	MMCF 48.8
H_2S as % of Intake	

$$\left(\frac{48.8}{927}\right) \times 100 = 5.26\%$$

Converting H_2S Loss to Long Tons of Sulfur

1 lb. mol @ 32°F, 14.7 Psia = 359.05
Molecular weight of H_2S = 34
Molecular weight of S = 32
Texas railroad Commission reporting condition = 60°F, 14.6 psia

cft/lb of H_2S

$$= \frac{359.05}{34} \times \frac{460 + 60}{460 + 32} \times \frac{14.70}{14.65} = 11.21 \text{ cft/lb of } H_2S$$

Sulfur per million cubic feet of H_2S

$$\frac{1,000,000}{11.20} \times \frac{1}{2240} \times \frac{32}{34} = 37.48 \text{ LT/MMCF of } H_2S$$

Total sulfur in long tons produced = 37.48 x 48.8
= 1830 LT/Yr.

Apparent sulfur recovery (based on the data available from the same source as above or by survey) - 54.4%

Total sulfur recovered from this plant
(.54 x 1830) = 990 Long Tons/Year

Sulfur emitted by plant (including flaring)
1830-990 = 840 LT/Yr.

This is the figure that must go into the summary of the county or the AQCR's total emissions and is entered into the work sheet 2 and work sheet 3 in their respective columns.

If the data on emissions are available from an other source for example in this case - the total apparent emissions - (processed and unprocessed gas) is reported as 852 L. tons. The two figures are close enough and either one of them could be used.

Whenever a large discrepancy occurs between the reported values then certain discretion has to be used. The values used in this study are those in the column labelled - "As estimated by Ecology Audits." One of the major objectives of this study was to resolve such differences in data.

Example Plant of Any County, Any State

Input data 46 grains/100 SCF

Plant Intake 70184 MMCF

Long Tons of Sulfur = 70184 x 46 x .0006

= 1937

Apparent sulfur recovery 55%

Amount Recovered = .55 x 1937

= 1065.0

Amount Emitted = 872 Tons/Yr.

This figure is entered in County totals on Work sheet W 2

Compute percentage of H_2S-Given the SO_2 Emissions by the Agency.

S(Long Tons) = SO_2 in tons/year x .4464

1 MMCF of H_2S = 37.48 Long Tons

Amount of H_2S IMMCF)

$$= \frac{SO_2 \text{ Emissions} \times .4464}{37.48} = 0.0119 \times (SO_2 \text{ emissions})$$

Example - SO_2 emissions (T/Yr.) = 21311

S emissions (LT/Y) = .4464 x 21311

= 9513 Long Tons

Plant Intake = 2026 MMCF

Amount of H_2S (MMCF) = .0119 x 9513

= 113.2

Assuming an apparent sulfur recovery = 55%

$$\text{Total amount of } H_2S \text{ (MMCF)} = \frac{113.2}{.45} = 251$$

$$H_2S \text{ \% in Gas Stream} = \frac{251}{2026} \times 100$$

= 12.4%

NOTE: The apparent sulfur recovery along with the SO_2 emissions (reported in tons/year) can be used to find out gas intake analysis.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS ON DATA

General Approach in the Evaluation of Data used by Ecology Audits In Cases where Data were Missing.

General Approach To Evaluate the Data

As pointed out earlier in this evaluation the Ecology Audits survey had to gather information from some of the plants on their H_2S percentages, plant intake and the amount of sulfur recovered. This information, in some cases where it was not publicly available had to be obtained from the data gathered by a worldwide service company as part of their (service company) contracts with the individual plants. These data are confidential and are not disclosed.

However, in order to evaluate how good the figures used by Ecology Audits are, Kellogg has taken the following approach.

1. Tabulate data for a given AQCR or a county (if county has a large number of plants) - in a table as shown in (MWK W 2)

2. Obtain figures for different columns from the data sheets supplied by Ecology Audits and get averages for public data.

3. Compare these averages with the values substituted or supplied by Ecology Audits.

4. Determine the amount of deviations between data available and perform other statistical analysis on the data used by Ecology Audits Inc. for the purpose of this study.

The conclusions drawn on the validity of the data and the confidence that can be placed on the overall figures is based on the above steps. This will give a fairly good idea of the accuracy of the measurements made by the Service company and the data gathered by the Ecology Audits' survey.

Analysis of Data on County/AQCR Basis

To illustrate the approach described above and show the step by step calculations in arriving at the conclusion on the validity of the data for a given county or AQCR the following worksheets have been used by Kellogg.

Worksheet 1) MWK-W 1 - (Statistical Analysis by County)
Worksheet 2) MWK-W 2 - (Summary of Data by County)

where necessary the source of data and calculations have been indicated.

Some of the plants do vent some of the gas and to determine what % of the intake is vented and establish the overall % of the gas that is vented a breakdown for this quantity is also computed.

Based on the analysis of the data supplied for missing values of H_2S for a particular region the following conclusions are drawn.

1. The values substituted for missing data for a few of the plants with missing data in the AQCR regions reviewed by Kellogg the data fell within the 95% confidence limits.

2. Whenever the % of H_2S appeared to be exceptionally high, the cause for it was determined by reviewing the raw data supplied. This was generally due to the fact that the plant was a recycling plant and H_2S %

was not a true figure. This has been discussed in greater detail in Section IV of this report.

With regard to the % of unprocessed gas vented the following conclusion is drawn.

The % in most of the plants is less than 1% of the intake gas and only in a few plants is this % higher.

For an explanation of this, the raw data and the operators' comments have to be referred to for that particular plant. Section IV outlines some of the possible reasons for this discrepancy.

References -

(1) "Pollution Control in the Petroleum Industry", Jones, H.R., Noyes data Corporation, 1973.

(WORKSHEET MWK-W 1)

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS (MWK-W 2) BY COUNTY/AQCR

Refer to Worksheet (MWK-W 2) for the corresponding State, and County.

State :
AQCR Region :
County(s) :
Number of plants in this Region :
Number of plants with complete Data:
Number of plants with missing percentage of H_2S :
Number of plants with public Data on H_2S percentages :
Average % of H_2S in the gas in this area :
Average of Values % of H_2S used by Ecology Audits based on their data :
% of vented gas computation :
Average % of gas vented using Public Data :
Average % of gas vented using Ecology Data :

Statistical Analysis of Above Data

95% Confidence Limit on the % H_2S for this region --
95% Confidence Limit on the % of gas vented in this region --

WORKSHEET (MWK-W 2)

THE M. W. KELLOGG COMPANY
A DIVISION OF PULLMAN INCORPORATED

DESCRIPTION

CUSTOMER

DATE 12/6/74
BY H.A. Khan

EST NO.
JOB NO. 4118-26

STATE/AQCR/COUNTY	PLANT NO.	% H$_2$S GAS PRODUCED PUBLIC DATA	ECOLOGY AUDITS	DIFFERENCE ABS. %	PLANT INTAKE (MMCF) PUBLIC DATA	ECOLOGY AUDITS	REPORTED	S.EMISSIONS (T/YR.) PUBLIC DATA	ECOLOGY AUDITS	DIFFERENCE ABS. %	DATA ON VENTING % OF MMCF INTAKE		
	01												
	02												
	03												
	04												
	05												
	06												
	07												
	08												
	09												
	10												
	11												
	12												
TOTAL													

CODA 11 11-64